The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. XLI. NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1925 NUMBER 529

Contents

The Week 208

Editorials

The Revival of Anti-Federalism..... 211
Reasons for Cancellation 214
The Choice at Muscle Shoals..... 215

General Articles

Bankers and the Conspiracy Law.....
.....Felix Frankfurter and James M. Landis 218
The Interallied Debts.....John Maynard Keynes 221
The Tragedy of Eugene O'Neill...T. K. Whipple 222
Complete Sex-Transformation in Adult Animals..
..... Oscar Riddle 225
An Interview with a Young Lady.....
.....Chester T. Crowell 228
Maggie (verse) .....Witter Bynner 230
Washington Notes.....T. R. B. 230

A Communication..... 231

Alone (verse).....Dorothy Leonard 232

Correspondence 232

Reviews of Books

Paul Bunyan.....Robert Littell 234
Gypsy Anthropology.....C. E. Ayres 235
Types and Personalities.....Henry B. Fuller 236
Imperial Plantations.....Llewelyn Powys 237
The Dark Wood.....W. A. Norris 238
A Female Monster of 1825.....
.....Elisabeth Anthony Dexter 239
The German Documents.....Sidney B. Fay 239
Fiction Briefs 240

The Week

NOT in many years have such numerous changes in government personnel taken place as were announced last week. Secretary Hughes has resigned to return to private life and Ambassador Kellogg is to succeed him. Alanson B. Houghton, now at Berlin, will probably succeed Mr. Kellogg at the Court of St. James's. Justice McKenna, of the Supreme Court, has also resigned and Attorney-General Harlan F. Stone has been nominated to take his place. President Coolidge has selected Charles B. Warren of Detroit, former Ambassador to Japan and Mexico, for his new Attorney-General. Mrs. Mabel Willebrandt who, as Assistant Attorney-General, has made so many enemies among politicians by her attempt to secure honest enforcement of the prohibition law, is being considered for a federal judgeship in California. Secretary of Labor Davis is almost certain to resign in the immediate future. We are glad to add that the similar reports about Justice Holmes are without foundation. Apparently they originated in quarters where the wish was father to the rumor.

THE resignation of Secretary Hughes seems to us less surprising than some Washington dispatches would indicate, though it is true that he had supposedly planned to remain another year in the hope that an armament conference would be held in Washington this summer—an expectation now seen as unrealizable. Doubtless several reasons impelled the Secretary of State to give up his portfolio. He has been sacrificing each year the very large sum he can earn at the bar, and is not a man of substantial fortune. While he has since 1921 been able to determine America's foreign policy in several important particulars, most of the pressing problems in which he has interested himself have either been cleared up or have reached a point of more or less permanent quiescence. No doubt he did not relish the prospect of frequent conflicts with Senator Borah, now chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have no reason to assume that Mr. Hughes has aspirations to be the Republican presidential candidate in 1928; but if he had, propriety would demand that he withdraw from the Cabinet of the man who will certainly wish to succeed himself. Finally, Mr. Hughes has undoubtedly found that the position produces more brickbats than bouquets. He has enjoyed the work; but he cannot be unaware that his general reputation has not been enhanced by the manner in which he has conducted his office.

MR. HUGHES without question has one of the finest legal minds of this generation; but its legalistic character is itself something of a handicap in statesmanship; it produces a Calhoun rather than a Lincoln, a Poincaré rather than a Gambetta. As Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes has regarded himself as the attorney for the United States. It is the duty of an attorney to demand for his client full justice whatever the unlikelihood of its being realized, or the harm it would do to the other litigants. Such an attitude, we believe, has been particularly unfortunate when held during the post-war years by one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose position is virtually that of American Prime Minister. It has resulted in making Europe feel that this country is a Shylock demanding its pound of flesh from its unfortunate late Allies. Mr. Hughes has several times, and most notably in the creation of the Dawes plan, abandoned his formal truculence, gone behind the scenes, and labored heartily for conciliation, compromise and understanding; but only his full-dress and formal attitude has been remembered. While regarding the results of this as regrettable, the New Republic is glad to recognize and applaud the intelligence, vigor and incorruptibility with which he has performed the functions of his office during a trying period.

WE take it for granted that in putting Mr. Kellogg in Mr. Hughes's place, President Coolidge is merely making an interim appointment until he can look around and pick out, carefully and at his leisure, the man with whom he wishes to work for the next four years. We cannot believe he intends to do the work himself, as Mr. Wilson did when he selected Robert Lansing to be his rubber-stamp. As a device to withhold pressure from himself for a few months while he is making up his mind, the present appointment is probably harmless. That Mr. Kellogg will be Secretary of State until 1928 seems to us as unlikely as it would be unfortunate. A double-dyed reactionary corporation lawyer from Minnesota, he was appointed to the Court of St. James's as a lame duck who must be taken care of, and not even then until the post had been offered in vain to Elihu Root and Frank O. Lowden. Mr. Kellogg has done some useful work in London, with diligence and discretion; but there are scores of men in his party who are better fitted for the second most important post in the executive branch of the government.

OF the elevation of Mr. Stone to the Supreme Court bench it must be said that he is a vastly superior choice to some others whom President Coolidge was reported to be considering. He is a man of outstanding character and high intelligence—just the sort of person who was needed, as we said at the time, to restore the Department of Justice after its misadventures under Harry Daugherty. But while these qualities are also useful in a Supreme Court Justice, they are not the final test of his fitness. The great function of the Court is interpretation of constitutional questions, and this in turn depends upon the social and economic outlook of the members. Only time will tell how far Mr. Stone's personal leaning toward conservatism will affect his action when the Court is called upon to bring the law into accord with the changing aspect of our civilization.

AS to another appointment it is also fair to suspend judgment. Mr. Warren's past experience has been of such a character that it is hard to judge from it what sort of Attorney-General he will make. The opposition to him in the ranks of the Michigan congressional delegation seems to have been political and not personal. Still we cannot but regret the fact that some years ago Mr. Warren served the Havemeyer sugar interests in a decidedly dubious capacity, holding in his own name a big block of shares of the Michigan Sugar Corporation, which really belonged to the Havemeyers, and gave them a large degree of control of a supposedly competitive part of the industry. An Attorney-General ought to have a clean record, especially in view of our experience during the Harding régime.

IN choosing his new Secretary of State and Attorney-General, the President has acted on his own initiative and has exhibited the characteristic color of his mind. Not only are Kellogg and Warren smaller men than Hughes and Stone; they are conservative as Coolidge is conservative, not aggressively but statically, with a general inertia which is produced not by conviction but by nature. We do not question the right of any President to select as his co-workers the sort of men with whom he feels at home; we merely note the results in this case as illustrative of Mr. Coolidge's temperament.

A CHARACTERISTIC example of the good faith of contemporary party politics is the treatment which the Child Labor Amendment is receiving in New York. Both the Democratic and Republican parties in that state have promised expressly to bring about the ratification of the Amendment by the Legislature. The Democratic state platform pledged the party in favor of "ratification by the Legislature of the Federal Child Labor Amendment." The Republican platform is more argumentative but no less explicit. "Unless we can produce," it proudly and loftily declaims, "wholesome and happy children, material prosperity, industrial development and natural wealth will all be futile. In conformity with this spirit and following Republican policy and tradition we favor the ratification by the Legislature of the state of New York of a Twentieth Amendment to the Constitution proposed by a Republican Congress for the prevention of child labor." A voter, consequently, who considered the Amendment of the utmost importance might have voted for any candidate of either party for a seat in the State Senate or Assembly with entire assurance that the man whom he elected would vote for ratification, but if so he would have been mistaken and betrayed. Both parties have repudiated their promises. The Republicans now propose, instead of ratification by the Legislature, the submission of the Amendment to popular vote. The Democrats have not declared themselves, but Governor Smith, who is, for all practical purposes, the Democratic party of the State, ignores his own platform and also favors a popular referendum. The object and probable effect of such a referendum would be to defeat the Amendment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE betrayal in this case is particularly deliberate and purposeful. It is the beginning of a systematic attempt to alter the Constitution so that hereafter all amendments will have to be ratified by a popular referendum rather than by the legislatures. Senator Wadsworth, the Republican leader of New York, has introduced a resolution to this effect into Congress. There are indications that it will receive the support of the Republican leaders both in the Senate and the House. In all probability it will be submitted to the state legislatures by the next Congress. It is one of those proposals which politicians of all kinds do not like to oppose. Governor Smith of New York in his message to the Legislature warmly approves of it. He calls attention to his first message to the Legislature of 1923 wherein he recommended that New York state initiate the proposal which Senator Wadsworth has since formally introduced. The Senator is usually opposed to constitutional amendments and particularly to amendments which diminish the power of representative bodies and increase direct popular political action, but in this matter he is a convert to unmediated democracy.

THERE is a reason for the interest which men like Senator Wadsworth are taking in this particular proposal. The proposal itself is shrewdly conceived as one which progressives will find it difficult to oppose, but which will enormously increase the future difficulty of adapting the federal Constitution to modern conditions. If it is adopted, the people who are in favor of an amendment will be obliged not merely to convert two-thirds of Congress to its desirability but they will have to go into three-fourths of the states and build up a sufficiently powerful local organization to win an election. In some instances, it is true, this might not be necessary. The income tax amendment could doubtless have been carried without such preparation. But certainly none of the other recent amendments could have been. The expenditure of time and money which would be required to pass proposed amendments would be sufficient to discourage any but the most fanatical and opulent band of reformers. That, no doubt, explains Senator Wadsworth's interest in the proposal. It is intended to increase the difficulties of amending the Constitution of the United States. Some years ago there was much discussion of a so-called gateway amendment which would render the process of modification easier and quicker. The present proposal is devised, so far as possible, to close a gate which has in conservative opinion swung open too far and too often. We shall have more to say about it later.

THE settlement at Paris as to American claims on Germany has been an excellent thing psychologically, even if not of great importance financially. America is to participate in the payments under the Dawes plan to the extent of 2¼ percent of the total, on the score of war damages. We shall also receive $13,750,000 a year on the cost of our army of occupation. Theoretically, the two items together should bring in $27,500,000, on the assumption that Germany will pay 2,500,000,000 marks annually. The war damage claim should be settled in twenty-five years, and the occupation costs in about two-thirds as long. The present capital value of the claim has thus been greatly reduced. On the total amount, indeed, the annual payments are so small that if they be regarded as interest, the debt will never be amortized, and if they be regarded as amortization, no interest is being paid—despite the fact that at least a third of the sum represents expenditures for which our government borrowed the money at an average interest rate of 4 percent.

SUCH financial calculations, however, have no real meaning in the present case. Our two bills against Germany are actually bad debts, and whatever we receive may be counted as pure gain. No serious economist expects that Germany will be able over any period of years to create the export balance necessary to meet the Dawes payments. Not only the United States, but the Allies, are virtually sure to find their financial expectations unrealized. The chief gain from the Paris settlement is that it resolves an international dispute which was threatening the goodwill between Great Britain and America, and does so in a manner which somewhat allays the charge that we are a nation of Shylocks. We shall be most fortunate if we can arrive at a settlement of the other pending problem—that of inter-allied debts—one-half so satisfactory.

THE New Republic has frequently disagreed with President Coolidge; and is therefore particularly glad to recognize that his action in two recent instances has been courageous, honorable and wise. In putting his foot down on the jingoistic efforts to embroil us with Japan he acted effectively and skilfully in the interest of international peace. He has just taken a similar and equally meritorious step in relation to the question of raising gun elevation on our battleships in order to make our range of fire equal to the British. However complete may be our legal right to do this, the President is correct when he points out that it would be a violation of the spirit of the Washington Conference. It cannot be too often repeated that the only disarmament of any value is moral disarmament. Unless the nations want peace, and can be persuaded to behave toward one another in that spirit, technical agreements are written in water. Ever since 1921, both within the navy and among some bellicose-minded private citizens there has been a persistent attempt to break down the spirit of the Conference and introduce what would be in effect a resumption of the old and ruinous armament race. President Coolidge has now spanked these gentlemen properly. We hope they will stay spanked.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWENTY cotton mills in New England reduced wages in November (after the fifth), some fifteen more in December, and now the shower has become a downpour with cuts in the large centres of Fall River and New Bedford. We turn back with interest to the words of a reporter in the Daily News Record, the textile trade daily, on October 22.

> The political effect of wide-spread reductions in the mills would have been disastrous, it is believed, to mill interests, which desire Republican success because of the protective tariff policy of the Republican party. This, coupled with the fact that approaching winter would make a more difficult time to strike, caused many manufacturers, who believed wages must come down, to conclude that the best time to start their drive for lower wages would be after election.

In the natural course of events the mills are beginning to make more goods and more money, for raw cotton is down on account of a large crop and demand for cloth is picking up after a long period of slack production. The normal profits will be added to the tariff increment. Yet the long-planned wage reductions are going into effect. With the indemnity levied on the workers, we have no doubt that net incomes of the mills in 1925 will be amply sufficient to pay good dividends on the inflated war valuations of their capital. Mill operatives who voted for prosperity are now enabled to see whose prosperity they voted for. The chances are that by the time another election rolls around the over-equipment of the industry in relation to the consumers' purchasing power, coupled with bad management, will have led to another spell of low production and another chance to vote for prosperity. How long can the cotton interests get away with it?

GOVERNOR JONATHAN DAVIS of Kansas has not only ended his term amid extraordinary charges that he misused the pardon power, but has come under grave suspicion in connection with the state university. The day after Christmas Governor Davis, acting in concert with two Democratic members of the State Board of Administration, summarily removed Dr. Ernest H. Lindley from his post as Chancellor of the University of Kansas. The object of this attack, says Chancellor Lindley, and he is backed, apparently, by 8,000 alumni and 5,000 students of the University, is wholly political. Lindley has stubbornly resisted the disposition of the Governor to use university appointments as political plums. This suspicion has been bruited for some time. Several weeks ago a series of changes were made in the personnel of the university medical school against the apparent opposition of the Chancellor. Not only the men who were then removed but Lawrence and Kansas City newspapers charged the Governor with political motives for this interference. The dismissal of Chancellor Lindley has been motivated by a perfunctory investigation of his suspension of four students for drinking, and later of his administration of university funds. But it is not customary to remove a university head upon the basis of an executive investigation nor to dismiss him like a hired hand. Neither is it customary for governors to make appointments to the staffs of the universities under their general control.

NOW that the President's veto of the postal salary increase bill has been sustained by a margin of one vote, we shall have a chance to judge his wisdom as an employer and his force as a statesman. An overwhelming public opinion believes that the increases are deserved, and the President himself did not disagree, except in detail. His veto was based chiefly on the policy of economy. He did not want to add anything to the burden of taxation, but insisted that the Post Office Department must pay its own way by securing the necessary funds before enlarging its expenditures. The employes insisted that their right to consideration was prior to and independent of the necessity of raising rates. They foresaw that once the question of increased rates was injected into the discussion, the powerful interests affected might delay action indefinitely. Apparently their fears were well founded. Up to the present, Mr. Cooldige's action has been wholly negative. His policy is now sustained, however, and it is his duty to carry through its positive implications. Will he apply to Congress as determined a pressure to raise rates as he did to prevent salary increases without higher rates? Will he be as courageous in opposing the wealthy publishers and mail-order houses as he was in opposing the impoverished postal employes?

The Revival of Anti-Federalism

THE American people, it is now apparent, are entering on a new phase of their oldest and most inveterate political conflict. Starting with the formation of the Union there have usually been two parties: one of which refused proposed increases of federal authority as undesirable interferences with state sovereignty and the other of which welcomed such increases from time to time as essential to American national fulfillment. Hitherto the second of these parties has almost uniformly triumphed over the first. The tide of American political development has run overwhelmingly in the direction of an increase of federal power and responsibility. Particularly since the Civil War a steady tendency has prevailed to increase by legislation, by constitutional amendment and to some extent by judicial construction the functions of the federal government. When proposals to that effect were under discussion, the old fears and dogmas occasionally flared up, but until recently the suspicion of the federal government which once bulked so large in American popular political consciousness was by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way of disappearing. The American people were coming to consider it as an indispensable agency of their positive social purposes. Little by little the United States has changed from a federation of territorial, individualistic democracies into a highly organized social democracy which could not escape the conscious assumption of a collective responsibility for the popular welfare. Prominent lawyers or politicians continued, when some increase in the functions of the federal government was proposed, to protest in the name of what was called states' rights, but their protests were usually verbal and insincere. Both political parties forgot the scruples which their members cherished against national aggrandizement whenever they were in power and found some increase of federal authority convenient.

Since, however, the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment and the experiences of the Great War, the protests against proposed increases of federal authority have become comparatively weighty and sincere. The deplorable effects of the attempt to accomplish a desirable social purpose by the absolute federal proscription of alcoholic drinks have aroused the old suspicions of proposed increases in federal authority. Many intelligent and disinterested citizens are afraid that, if the process of centralizing the socializing and regulative activities of government in Washington continues, the American people will ultimately be ruled by a necessarily irresponsible federal bureaucracy which will dry up the sources of local initiative and responsibility. They consider the United States too large, populous and diversified a country to be wholesomely or even safely governed by one dominant political machine. The process of centralization has in their opinion already proceeded so far that it has enfeebled the state governments. The only way to restore them to vitality is to resist the easy but dangerous alternative of calling in the federal authority as the solve-all of American politics, and to force on social reformers the duty and necessity of accomplishing their purposes through agitation within the states and action by them.

The New Republic sympathizes with the object which these protestants have in mind and the local political values which they wish to preserve. The United States is too large and too unwieldy to be safely governed from Washington alone, and it would be disastrous to duplicate in this country the amount of centralized political control which a European nation might adopt with impunity. It is most important for American political leaders and thinkers to consider how they can counteract the tendency toward centralization, and what they can do to repair the ineptitude of American local government and the diminishing importance of neighborhood organization in American social, political and economic activity. But we are utterly sceptical of the success of any effort to restore the vitality of American state political institutions which begins by opposition to proposed increases of federal authority such as the Child Labor Amendment.

The opposition itself may in this and other similar cases for the present succeed. The business interests which are opposed to any further interference by the government with their affairs are more powerful, more conscious and better organized than ever before. If they can obtain the assistance of a large body of disinterested and public spirited people, they can paralyze for many years the progress of effective federal social legislation. But their success will not check the onward march of those economic tendencies which are bringing about a centralized and specialized organization of American business and professional life and depriving the local units of their appropriate culture and their vital functions. They will only condemn to frustration any experimental attempts by an effective political agency to cope with the results of economic centralization and its effects on American social life.

The centralization of American business and the standardizing of American culture are proceeding with prodigious momentum. They will inevitably travel much further before they are checked. The refusal to parallel the increasingly interstate organization of American business by a corresponding increase of federal political control will do nothing to revive American local initiative and sense of responsibility, but its effects will alarm American popular opinion, particularly in the cities, and increase the existing tendency to excitability and violence. The refusal would imply an incompatibility between state and federal regulation and the necessity of mutually exclusive spheres of action for each which will not work in a highly organized society such as the United States of today. The two functions are really supplementary. The success of a federal system depends upon an assignment of powers and responsibilities to the central and local governments which varies at different times in response to changing conditions, but which always assumes coöperation rather than antagonism. The distribution of responsibility between the states and the nation which was advisable in 1789 or in 1865 or in 1900 is not advisable in 1925, and a distribution which may be advisable today will certainly be obsolete in another thirty years. When you confer upon the federal government a function which the state cannot adequately perform, you do not take away from the states powers which you give to the nation. You create and exercise a new power which did not exist and could not be properly exercised before.

In the matter of legislation for social welfare the distribution in the Constitution of power between the state and federal governments was based upon a conception of their respective functions which has been growing more dubious just in proportion as the industrial revolution transformed the values and culture of American society. In 1789 private property consisted chiefly in land, chattels, utensils and consumers' goods. It was by means of the secure

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ownership of private property that an individual citizen built the economic foundations of personal independence. Ownership conferred on him power over his own destiny rather than over the destiny of other people. The Fathers of the Republic thought, consequently, they were solving the social problem by inserting in the Constitution, as the chief responsibility of the federal system, provision for unhampered opportunities to acquire property and for security in its possession. The essence of the social problem was from their point of view the impregnable guarantee of these individual rights. The function of supervising the exercise of these was not a matter upon which agreement was either essential or desirable; and it was, consequently, reserved to the states. They had in their opinion divorced property from privilege and associated it with industry and thrift. The exercises of any power conferred by the ownership of such purified property required little supervision and there was from their point of view every reason why it should vary in different localities and be determined by local interests.

As a consequence, however, of the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century the Fathers did not solve the social problem as finally as they assumed. The vast mass of property now no longer consists of the instruments of individual activity and the objects of individual desire. It consists in the shares of corporations, which own prodigious machines situated in all parts of the country. They manufacture for a national market and are tied together by an intricate and complicated organization. The ownership of such property brings with it little control over one's own life, but often an immense influence on the lives of other people, both consumers and employes; and this influence is usually exerted without much solicitude except for the interests of the owners and the managers of the property. The social problem has come to consist in a search for adequate means of subordinating to social and moral control the prodigious power over the lives of other people which these owners and managers have acquired.

The consideration of this new social problem has become the chief preoccupation of law makers in all industrialized countries. The American nation is, however, poorly organized for the task. The federal system was planned, as we have seen, chiefly to protect private property on the supposition that individual liberty and self-determination could not exist without scrupulous respect for titles to property and a free hand for individuals in acquiring it and using it. This supposition has ceased to be true. Liberty for the individual has now come to depend rather upon the limitations which consumers, employes and the government learn how to place on the exercise of economic power. Unfortunately, however, in this country the branch of the government to which the Fathers assigned the political part of this job is the states; and they lack both the power and the will to exercise effective supervision according to common ideas and standards. Now that organized business is much the most powerful estate of the realm, and its activities pervade the entire country, the local governments are not and cannot be sufficiently prepared to redeem a responsibility for the social consequences of business activity. The chief defect of the proposed Twentieth Amendment is not that it goes too far in fastening increased social responsibility on the federal government but that it does not go far enough. What is needed is an attempt to supplement the police power of the states with a general grant to Congress of concurrent jurisdiction over social questions.

But it will be many years before democracy will learn how to control business. For the present the tide is running the other way. The business interests, which are claiming exemption from further public interference on the ground that their huge aggregations of capital and economic power are entitled to immunities and guarantees similar to those which the Fathers wished to confer on the petty property of their day, are increasingly determined to prevent such interference from taking place. Their success, as they very well know, will depend in part upon the building up of effective resistance to any increase in authority of the federal government. They are putting up their first fight on the proposed Twentieth Amendment, and they have recruited for the struggle able and disinterested people all over the country who prefer, because of constitutional scruples, to see legislation for the protection of children and youth fail rather than let it prevail by virtue of federal authority. It looks as if the combination would defeat the proposed Amendment; and if it does there can be no doubt with whom the victory will lie. Public opinion will interpret it as a triumph for the interests which are opposed to federal interference with business and as a definite check to the whole process of adapting by legal means the federal system to the needs of an industrial and social democracy. They will have defeated the Amendment by arguments which will be even more effective when invoked against any subsequent proposal to increase the power of the federal government for social purposes.

Excepting in the case of a few individuals and newspapers the opponents of the Amendment are employing to defeat it the most unscrupulous and flagrant misrepresentation. Their success, if they do succeed, will increase their prestige and their confidence in such methods. It will correspondingly discourage their adversaries. Their adversaries will have reason to be discouraged. Hitherto the advocates of progressive social legislation have been sufficiently united in their belief in the national government as the most desirable and effective instrument of their purposes. In the future they will be divided among themselves as to the means which they ought to adopt for the accom-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plishment of their ends; and their ability to carry out their program will be proportionately weakened. It is another example of the obscurity and confusion which have during the past five years taken possession of the American political scene. There are radical differences of opinion and outlook in the counsels of both the old parties, but these differences are surpassed by the similar differences which exist among the progressives. The older progressivism which expected to accomplish a constantly expanding social program by legislative and administrative action is clearly disintegrating. The conservatives, in spite of their own dissensions, will have it their own way until a more realistic progressivism, founded on a sufficient popular motivation, takes its place.

Reasons for Cancellation

MR. JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES'S contention that the French and Italian debts to the United States and Great Britain cannot be paid in full, and that their payment, even if possible, would not be beneficial to this country, appears to be well founded. But we do not agree with his argument in this issue of the New Republic to the effect that these debts are not commercial obligations but are "political"; and that they should be forgiven because they represent merely a share in the common effort of the War. This argument, it seems to us, is not a realistic account of the facts, and efforts to procure its acceptance will do more harm than good. If the debts must be scaled down or cancelled, let it be done as a repudiation necessarily arising out of the economic situation, not by the subterfuge of calling them something else than debts.

The argument runs that each of the nations threw its whole effort into the War, that each wisely contributed to the common cause what it could best contribute, that France's share was chiefly man power, Britain's to a larger extent naval, America's financial, and so on. Why should America expect to retrieve its share when the other shares are irretrievable? But it is not true that each nation threw its entire resources into the achievement of a common object. Each, to be sure, desired to defeat the Central Powers, but each also wished to maintain its own assets as far as possible for use in the post-war period; each had national ambitions and policies. In so far as its resources had to be devoted to common military objects, they had to be withdrawn from these particularistic efforts, and in so far as American financial aid was extended, it enabled the Allies not only to wage war more effectively but also to devote more effort to building up their national power and prestige.

This appears most clearly when we consider the sums lent by us to cover expenditures undertaken before we entered the War and after the Armistice. About one-third of the foreign obligations due the United States government arises from such items. As Garet Garrett pointed out over two years ago, nearly $650,000,000 of American governmental loans were used to pay off obligations of allied nations to private bankers in this country incurred before March, 1917, every cent of which was secured by marketable investments deposited here by the foreign governments. These securities might have been sold to meet the private loans on their maturity. It would have been inconvenient for war purposes to sell them but this does not alter the fact that the net result of the policy adopted was to preserve intact over half a billion dollars of capital investment for the nations concerned. And between the Armistice and July 1, 1919, this government extended loans totalling as follows:

to France.	$1,027,427,800
to Italy	629,789,000
to Great Britain	576,000,000
to Belgium	176,834,467
	$2,410,051,267

Part of this credit made possible immediately necessary relief. But in addition, the respite which it furnished to allied treasuries permitted numerous public and private expenditures, not strictly within the scope of war objectives, which could not have been allowed to such an extent if the governments concerned had had to rely solely on internal loans and taxes. France maintained a large military establishment in anticipation of something like the Ruhr invasion, if not of more extensive adventures, she loaned money to the nations of eastern and southern Europe to further her diplomatic purposes, she adopted measures of internal reconstruction in line with the interests of her heavy industry. Italy's use of funds was equally particularistic. Britain strained every nerve to enlarge her foreign commerce and reinstate her merchant marine—much to the detriment of ours under the competitive situation existing. We do not mean to imply that most of these activities were not to be expected under the circumstances. But in view of the facts it is naïve to argue, concerning at least $3,500,000,000 of our $10,500,000,000 claim on Europe, that it was devoted to common war objects, rather than to maintaining or rebuilding the national assets of the several Allies.

Even during the War the same division of interests appeared. All the Allies, while buying in the United States, on credit extended by our government, strove to protect their foreign investments and their trade by charging and being paid in cash for things we bought abroad. The British charged us $90,000,000 for transporting a million of our troops. We paid cash for supplies bought for our army in France. We had to engage in earnest negotiations to secure as low prices on jute, wool,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tin, and so on, bought in the British Empire, as the British government itself paid, although in the United States the Allies were charged the same prices as were fixed for our government. Though American ships paid no port taxes in French harbors before we entered the War, they had to do so after we got in. The British government bought materials in the United States, at the same prices fixed for war uses, to sell for civilian purposes at home and so to maintain "business as usual" as far as possible. There was at one time a good deal of heartburning here because British steel was being sold in foreign civilian commerce, though so large a portion of our steel industry was being requisitioned for war uses. The American credits were also used to "peg" the allied exchanges, thus allowing allied currencies to retain their position as media of international trade. A good deal of effort was devoted, during the War, to extend and strengthen international trade positions of the Allies.

Most of these policies of course aided the allied nations in one way or another and so helped the winning of the War. But, without being meticulous, it is possible also to point out that they fortified these nations individually for commercial enterprises of peace. The War was not, in any of these details or a hundred others, a pure communistic effort in which sacrifices were equally shared, all resources pooled, and all benefits held for the general good. A large part of the war credits were in a very real sense commercial.

When we look at the larger aspects of the War, similar comments are inevitable. To assert that the War was fought for a common object of equal importance to all belligerents is to challenge contradiction. It is clearer now than eight years ago that the Allies shared at least some of the responsibility for the situation which gave rise to war, and that they shared it in unequal degree. With hostilities came differing degrees of urgency in repelling attack. There also arose separate war aims, many of them contradictory of the declared purposes of the United States. And the spoils of war were unequally divided. We did not have any desire to take over German colonies, and are somewhat doubtful of their ultimate value to the nations which did absorb them. Yet this fact merely emphasizes the limited interest of the United States in the effort which resulted in the Treaty of Versailles—a document whose ratification was opposed not merely by those sharing the views of the New Republic but by the dominant conservatives in America. The American stake in European affairs is real, but it was not well served by the peace and it is not coextensive with the several national interests of the European belligerents.

To plead for cancellation of debts on the basis of Mr. Keynes's present argument is therefore to call forth a fruitless discussion of comparative sacrifices and benefits, which can only obscure the issue and embitter the controversy. The lesson which will be brought home to American taxpayers and European public opinion by repudiation ought to rest not on specious moralizing but on the incontrovertible facts of the economic situation. The debts cannot be paid, or can be paid only at the cost of undesirable derangement of national and international economy. This means that war, even victorious war, cannot be waged on a large scale under modern conditions without leading to bankruptcy of the chief belligerents. Recognition of this fact might induce greater precaution against future war and more discerning inquiry into national objectives. And, if a war were actually under way, and the belligerents had reached a crisis where they had to receive financial assistance from a powerful nation hitherto neutral, it would be well for all concerned to understand that such assistance cannot be repaid after the arrival of peace. This might cause a more critical examination of the objective in view.

The Choice at Muscle Shoals

THE debate over Muscle Shoals has been so voluminous, the charges and counter-charges so frequent and sweeping, that the essential facts have been almost completely buried under a landslide of talk. It may be well, therefore, to get back to first principles and recall just what the fight is about.

The Muscle Shoals project, on the Tennessee river in Alabama, will have two uses. One is to produce fixed nitrogen, for use in the manufacture of fertilizer and munitions, and the other is to generate hydro-electric power, above the amount needed for the aforesaid nitrogen production. The latter purpose will need not more than 100,000 horsepower, and the surplus electricity available for distribution and sale throughout the South will amount to at least 500,000 horsepower, and perhaps half as much again. In this aspect alone, therefore, the project will be the second largest east of the Mississippi, exceeded only by Niagara.

On the development the United States has already spent about $135,000,000. The sum includes nitrate plants, dams for waterpower, a model town with 311 houses, a one-hundred-room hotel, the purchase of platinum worth $500,000, a railroad, cars, engines, etc.

The two points of view as to what should be done with Muscle Shoals, represented by Senators Underwood and Norris, begin by quarreling as to the real purpose of the project. Senator Underwood asserts it is a nitrate plant. His concern is to insure nitrogen for explosives in war time, and in particular, to provide cheap fertilizer to the farmer. His bill provides that 40,000 tons of nitrates must be manufactured each year at a profit of not more than 8 percent on the investment (not per year, but per turnover of capital).

Senator Norris, while recognizing the importance

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of nitrates, thinks the chief value of Muscle Shoals is as a source of hydro-electric power. He sees it as certain to remake the industrial life of the whole South within a wide radius. He wants the plant operated by the government because he is convinced that private operators will inevitably both profiteer at the expense of the consumer and fail to conduct their enterprise in general in the public interest.

Assuredly, there is ground for honest difference of opinion here. What are the facts in support of the arguments?

Senator Underwood openly admits that his bill permits an extremely bad bargain, from the public's point of view. It authorizes the leasing of property costing $135,000,000 to someone who will pay the government only 4 percent on the investment in one dam, which is $45,000,000. In fact, the actual return would be still smaller, because $200,000 a year which the government is now receiving for the steam-electric equipment at Nitrate Plant No. 2 would be cancelled. The net return would be $1,600,000 a year, a little more than 1 percent on the total investment. Senator Underwood blandly explains that he relies on the Secretary of War to make a better lease than his bill provides. But the country has recently—at Teapot Dome—had a bitter lesson as to the folly of relying solely on any cabinet officer to protect our natural resources from the looting which a careless Congress makes possible.

Turning to the question of nitrate production, what do we find? The Underwood measure requires nothing the first two years, 10,000 tons the third year, 20,000 the fourth, 30,000 the fifth and 40,000 tons thereafter. The United States now uses 200,000 tons per annum, so that what is proposed is at most but a 20 percent addition. The present cost to the consumer is twelve cents a pound, and the best that is hoped for under Muscle Shoals production—if the necessary new processes are invented—is a price of six cents a pound. On 40,000 tons a year the total saving, as Senator Howell has pointed out, would be $4,800,000, or about sixty cents for each farm operator in the country. It is possible, of course, that the price on the other 200,000 tons we are already using might be somewhat reduced as a result of the new competition—possible but not probable, since the market for fertilizer is an expanding one. Even if this happened, however, and the whole amount were produced at the theoretical Muscle Shoals price of six cents a pound, the saving would be only $3 a year for each farm. One must consider, to be sure, the chance that the lessee might produce more than his stipulated 40,000 tons of nitrates during and after the sixth year of his lease. But as everyone in the country except Senator Underwood knows very well, any prospective lessee would bid, not for the sake of the nitrate business but for the sake of the water power. True, in case of war he might find himself in a position to make huge profits; but in peace time, as things now stand, it is foolish to look for more than fulfillment of the letter of the lease on the manufacture of fertilizer.

What are the prospective profits on the hydro-electric power? Senator Howell, who for years has been a close student of electric production and distribution points out that at Dam No. 2, the lessee will be able to produce 200,000 horsepower at a total cost of $3,000,000 a year. If the same power were produced by steam, the cost would be $11,000,000 a year. Alabama consumers are now paying a basic rate of $49 per horse power per year, and the cost of production at Muscle Shoals will be but $15.

Opponents of the Underwood bill charge that the logical lessee under its terms will be the Alabama Power Company. This is a subsidiary of the Electric Bond and Share Company, which was owned, until it was thrown overboard with most undignified haste a week or two ago, by the General Electric Company, which has frequently and publicly been charged with controlling at least one-half of the hydro-electric power developments of America. Senator Underwood protests that his bill does not specify any lessee, and he is of course correct. At the same time, the Alabama Power Company owns the only transmission lines conveniently located to take power from Muscle Shoals; the Alabama Power Company is the chief corporation in that territory engaged in the business of selling electric power wholesale; the Alabama Power Company and its predecessors and allies have long been actively interested in the scheme for developing Muscle Shoals.

If the Alabama Power Company should, by some miraculous accident which Senator Underwood is unable to foresee, secure the lease, it will be able to link the project up with its own development on the Tallapoosa river, and produce an additional 414,000 horsepower, by reason of the reserve power created when two great generators are linked into one system. This extra power will cost even less—probably about $7.50 per horsepower per annum. If produced by steam it would cost $22,000,000 a year; and it is a safe bet that the consumer will have to pay for it as though it were being produced by steam—as he does now. And all this, remember, may cost the lessee the total sum of just $1,600,000 a year, while the government's annual loss in interest alone will be, if figured at the reasonable rate of 6 percent, about $9,000,000 a year.

Is the pessimism as to high rates for electric power under private operation justified? On this matter, as Senator Howell properly maintains, the experience in other parts of the country is valid evidence. The city of Cleveland long "enjoyed" private production of electricity, and the rate was twelve cents per kilowatt hour. A municipal plant was built which began producing power at three

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cents per kilowatt hour. Thereupon the private company came down to five cents, and stayed there, saving the people of Cleveland the not unimportant sum of $2,000,000 a year. Both these plants, the municipal and private, are operated by steam power. It is true the municipal one pays no taxes; but it sets aside each year in a reserve fund a sum equal to the taxes it would pay if it were privately owned.

What it means to the consumer may be illustrated by comparing rates on forty kilowatts, which is a month's supply of electricity for the ordinary household. In Cleveland the customer of private ownership pays $2 a month. The customer of the municipality pays $1.20. In Washington, D. C., the customer of the privately owned local plant pays for the same thing $4 a month. All three of these plants make their electricity by steam which costs more than does hydro-electric production. Use of the latter method, however, does not guarantee any lower rate to the consumer. At Niagara Falls, N. Y., in the shadow of the greatest hydro-electric power project east of the Mississippi, the consumer pays $2.26 for forty kilowatts, which is 88 percent more than the customer of the municipality in Cleveland pays. Taking some other localities where hydro-electric power is produced by private companies, we find that in several Alabama cities, the rate is 155 percent higher than in Cleveland. In Quincy, Illinois, it is 150 percent higher. In Atlanta, Georgia it is 166 percent higher. In Augusta, Georgia, it is 200 percent higher.

The general argument against public ownership and operation is that the government is less efficient and economical than is private industry. We regard this charge as by no means proved. It is generally based nowadays on the war record of the railroads, a record made after private operation had demonstrated its total incompetence to move troops and war supplies, and made when cost of service was rightly considered of no importance compared to winning the war. But even if the charge were true, it would still remain the less important half of the question. Private operation may be conducted efficiently from its own viewpoint and still be appallingly wasteful from that of the public interest. A lumberman may cut down a forest at a minimum expense per tree without satisfying those who know that the forest should not have been cut down at all that floods and erosion will do harm greatly outweighing the lumberman's profit on his operation.

The electric industry in the United States is a huge and perfectly respectable one. It has in its employ many intelligent men, some of whom are also public-spirited. But the one and only purpose of the private electric industry is to make money; and it is pure accident if that desire happens to coincide at any given time with the public interest. The largest profits may be secured by producing small amounts of power at a high price rather than large amounts at a minimum price. The profit motive may dictate the placing of new transmission lines at points where they will best throttle competition, rather than where they will best serve the public need. And of course, the profit motive always presses toward monopoly, and toward charging those who suffer under it "all that the traffic will bear." It is absurd to say that state public utility commissions will prevent these things from happening. Such commissions, in the first place, are almost always restricted by law from doing more than maintaining a specified ratio between profits and the more or less imaginary size of the investment. Even in this limited field the failure of public regulation to be effective is notorious.

At Muscle Shoals the government has the opportunity to perform a task of the greatest value. It can create one of the first links in the Giant Power system which in a few years will cover the whole country and will in our judgment be so important that it will be absolutely necessary for the federal authorities to recapture possession and conduct it in the general interest. The government can so operate Muscle Shoals as to create an enormous improvement of industrial, domestic and social conditions almost throughout the entire South. Instead of this, Senator Underwood and his friends propose to barter a $135,000,000 property for a mess of highly dubious nitrates. In order to save the farmers of the country an average of sixty cents a year, they intend to put the industrial future of the South in the hands of men who have never shown any indication of social responsibility which fits them for such a task. The Underwood followers are willing to accept a little more than 1 percent per annum on the government's present investment, and leave the consumer of electricity, whether for industrial or domestic uses, to be exploited remorselessly.

The Senator has objected to having his proposal termed a second Teapot Dome, and he is right, for the public loss and harm in the oil leases are smaller than the loss and harm which would ensue from private lease of Muscle Shoals. We believe Senator Underwood may live to see general agreement that he has done the South more harm than any other man of his generation, by devising the terms of his bill.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1925, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, SECRETARY AND PUBLISHER, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON *C. E. AYRES* *GEORGE SOULE*
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bankers and the Conspiracy Law

DURING the eighteenth century the common law made one of its great strides in becoming the accepted agency of social control in the field theretofore largely governed by the customs of merchants. In this absorption of the "law merchant," the common law left its characteristics upon the resulting law of the courts. It required the customs of merchants to conform in many ways to those of the great community of which they had become a part. The history of the common law is replete with such instances of enforcing upon one portion of society, that purported to be governed by its own axioms of conduct, doctrines and principles that it had developed to serve other interests and other groups.

The latest manifestation of such a phenomenon is the verdict of a Massachusetts jury rendered on December 18, 1924. Besides the striking facts that the trial consumed 187 days of the court's time and that the plaintiff was awarded the sum of $10,534,109.07, the case's importance lies in its application of an old principle to a yet untouched domain. To protect depositors, banks and their operations have come to some extent under legal control; but the huge, intangible field of credit upon which the whole superstructure of modern business rests was still unaffected. The rules of this game, intricate and complex in its manipulations but swift and decisive in operation, were left to be determined by the participants, largely the controllers of credit. A change, however, is in the making and by means strangely mocking in their origin.

The doctrine of civil and criminal conspiracy has old sources, but it led a precarious existence until the industrial era brought forth labor organizations to cope with the superior bargaining power of employers. Conflicts, of course, ensued, and the law took up the challenge of adjusting their and society's respective rights. The conception of the "right" of access to the labor market was developed, and an unreasonable interference with this "right" by a combination of laborers was translated into a conspiracy, and punished or enjoined. The principle was extended when courts generally took the view that though acts when committed by one man were lawful, their commission by a group acting in concert to further their own interests might be punishable.

It is this modernized ancient principle that has been invoked in the Willett-Sears case to brand as unlawful the combination of a group of banking interests to interfere with a manufacturer's access to the credit market. Most large concerns rely for their financing on neighboring banks that keep in close touch with the financial affairs of the business, and, in practice, control its credit. Outlying banks in buying the concern's commercial paper in turn rely on the information supplied to them by these local banks. Their unified tactics in refusing to extend credit upon established terms, the exertion of their combined pressure when they realized the manufacturer to be in a vulnerable position with a view to acquiring, in an unconscionable way, the business of the credit-seeker, with the result that in this case they eventually "purchased" factories with an established earning capacity of over a million dollars a year for a sum slightly in excess of $600,000, was held unjustifiable as a matter of law, for which a jury assessed ten million dollars as compensation.

These principles are unintelligible unless they are projected against the vivid background of the case itself. The story is told in a complicated record covering 15,000 pages of testimony. Its full significance cannot be realized except through a patient study of the long trial. The record is, of course, full of conflicting testimony. But the jury's verdict resolved these conflicts, sifted truth from falsity. The recital that follows is based upon the conclusions implicit in the jury's verdict. What emerges is a drama in the world of high finance that, irrespective of its import and implications, deserves telling for the sheer audacity it reveals and the light that it throws upon large scale financial operations.

The plaintiff Willett was in partnership with Sears under the firm name of Willett, Sears and Company. Of humble origin, he had traveled the road from bank-clerk and wool commission merchant to owner of some of the largest felt factories in New England. The defendants were three individuals—Herrick, a leading figure at the Boston bar, director of banks and numerous corporations and generally dominant in Boston's financial life, Fessenden of F. S. Mosely and Company and Winsor of Kidder, Peabody and Company and through their partners these two firms of investment brokers and private bankers with a commanding place in Boston's finances. Besides these defendants, the other main actors were Thayer, a former Boston banker but then president of the Chase National Bank of New York, and Wing, president of the First National Bank of Boston, a friend and associate of Herrick, to whom Wing was indebted for his position. These men were not only financial leaders of Boston; they were intimate friends. Some of them had been classmates at Harvard, and all of them carried these collegiate associations into their social life. To each other they were "Bob," "Harry," and "Euie." Willett was an outsider and an unpopular outsider.

In 1918 Willett and Sears held a controlling stock interest in two large manufacturing concerns, the American Felt Company and the Daniel Green

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Felt Shoe Company, and under Willett's plans, had acquired sixteen subsidiary companies that were to operate in conjunction with the main companies to form a complete textile and machinery group. The year 1918 found the partnership pressed for credit. Reckless over-expansion, wartime increases in labor and material costs, the seasonal character of the business, all contributed to create this situation. Willett had made the rounds of his banks, and they thus became acquainted with his necessities. They knew, too, of the disparity that existed between the quick assets of the companies and their current liabilities, but they also expressed belief in the essential soundness of the business and in the efficiency of the Willett-Sears management. Following the publication of a disappointing but not disconcerting annual report of the two main companies, the bank presidents met to discuss their seasonal requirements and their probable need of a special loan. In a series of these meetings the financial soundness of the companies was investigated. It was concluded that, for the greater security of the companies as well as that of the banks that might participate in a special loan, contraction should take place and power be reserved to liquidate subsidiary companies. Sears, at the suggestion of Fessenden, estimated the maximum requirement of the companies at not exceeding $3,000,000, a sum beyond their present actual needs but calculated to meet all emergencies. The proposition seemed acceptable to the bankers, and at another meeting on June 26, 1918, tentative terms were suggested whereby the control of the companies was to be placed with a committee of the bankers—a not unusual condition of a large loan—a commission of 6 percent was to be taken together with interest of 6 percent on the loan. It was to mature in six months and be given priority over all other outstanding liabilities of the companies.

At this time the Chase National Bank of New York, under the presidency of Thayer, held two notes of the partnership for $200,000 each, maturing on July 15 and October 15, 1918, and secured by collateral consisting of 14,000 common shares in the Felt Company, which represented a controlling interest in that corporation. The Girard National Bank of Philadelphia also held a similar note for $100,000, maturing on September 15, 1918, and secured by 2,000 common shares. Obviously some arrangement was necessary to meet these notes and protect the collateral in order to assure the bankers control.

By June 27 the bankers had agreed on the terms which the proposed loan should take, though no binding contract had been concluded. Fessenden, however, on whom the partners relied for information, failed to communicate to them a memorandum specifying these terms, and they were ignorant of the precise stage of the negotiations. The framing of this agreement was entrusted by the banks to Herrick, who through Wing and Fessenden had been acquainted with all the developments of the situation.

The immediate problem of the Chase Bank and its notes remained. Willett and Sears were unable to secure their extension. The Boston banks then suggested that Thayer deposit this stock with them. Thayer, at a meeting held in Boston on July 8, refused to relinquish control of the stock but suggested that he should participate in the three million dollar loan, so as to assure the Boston banks that he would exercise his control of this stock in their joint interest. The proposal seems to have been satisfactory, and its terms were recorded in a letter of that date, sent to Thayer by Fessenden, to which Thayer replied acceptance. These letters, perhaps the keynote of the case, must have convinced the jury that an agreement had been reached and that Fessenden's claim at the trial that this meeting had resulted in a deadlock was false. For Fessenden concealed these letters, and the partners believed his report that a deadlock had been reached in the negotiations with the banks during these critical days preceding the date on which the Chase Bank's note matured. Herrick also knew the exact situation; but he, too, was silent. On July 15 Sears pleaded with Thayer for an extension of the note but in vain; Thayer countered Sears with such a grasping offer that the latter reported to Willett that he had fallen into a "den of thieves."

Thus the partnership was forced to raise at the least the Chase $200,000. Willett failed to enlist Fessenden in the cause and turned in desperation to Winsor. The latter, up to this time ignorant of Herrick's and Fessenden's manipulations, alive to a highly profitable venture, induced Fessenden and his partners to join him, and agreed to make a loan of $500,000 for two years on the basis of a $500,000 commission and 6 percent interest. But again, upon the excuse that one of Fessenden's partners had "kicked it over" and by processes too long to recite, Herrick, whom Willett from the first had feared, was "invited" to participate in this loan. The pressure upon the partners had then become too great to resist. At Herrick's suggestion the terms were strengthened. The agreement now took the form of a purchase of the controlling interest in the Felt Company for $500,000 with an option in the partners to repurchase within a year and eleven months for $1,227,000. And further to satisfy the condition for the proposed loan of $3,000,000, the controlling interest in the Green Company and the subsidiary companies was directly or indirectly turned over to the purchase syndicate, consisting of Herrick, Fessenden and Winsor, to operate in behalf of the committee of bankers.

This transfer was completed on July 31, 1918, and immediately the purchase syndicate took measures whereby it would become impossible, as a business fact, for the partners to exercise their option of repurchase. Willett's resignation as a director of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

companies was demanded, and Sears followed his example. It was Willett that they primarily desired to eliminate and they did eliminate him. The syndicate disregarded all concern by Willett about the conduct of the business, cut him off from accurate reports as to the condition of the companies, and denied him access to the plants. Willett's plan for acquiring and reorganizing certain subsidiary companies was summarily dismissed by the bankers. But Herrick went farther. He took advantage of an opportunity to place a thirty-day mortgage on properties upon which Willett had hoped to raise the sum required by his plan. The mortgage fell due, remained unpaid, entry was made, a sale advertised, and the equity in the property made worthless.

Meanwhile other claims began to harass the partnership. One Sydeman brought suit upon a contract claim and attached the partnership property. This claim did not trouble Willett seriously, for Sydeman had indicated his willingness to settle for approximately $6,000. But there were outstanding notes of the subsidiary companies endorsed by the partners, which, if they should then be enforced, made bankruptcy a sinister possibility. Herrick's "Christmas shopping" consisted mainly of buying them in, under circumstances that leave little doubt as to motive. The device of a dummy was employed to purchase them and title taken in the name of the Salvage Syndicate so as to conceal his own part in the transaction. Suit was then brought by an outside law firm.

This outside firm was also conducting under Herrick's indirect guidance a suit on similar notes held by a former client of his and by the president of the Felt Company, with whom Herrick was in close contact.

Not only were attachments issued against all of Willett's property, but by the device of a bill in equity—another suggestion of Herrick's—the option of repurchase, a valuable asset belonging to the partnership, was sought to be reached. These events occurred in the latter part of January, 1919. About the same time sums totaling $125,000 were withdrawn from the subsidiary companies, then in process of liquidation, and deposited under names calculated to hide the fact that these sums were to be appropriated, as a substantial part was appropriated, to Herrick and Fessenden for their purported services. These withdrawals served to reduce the assets of the partnership in their subsidiary corporations. Not only were the purposes of these withdrawals veiled by the syndicate; the facts were concealed from the bankers as well as from Willett and Sears.

By this time Willett had employed counsel to protect his interests. Although among the most skilled and experienced of the Boston bar, they learned amazingly little of the financial condition of either of the two main or the subsidiary companies. The secret of the withdrawals was not disclosed, nor did they know that Herrick was concealed as the real actor behind the pressing claims of the creditors.

On January 24, 1919, Willett, in ill-health, went south, leaving his interests in counsel's hands. They suggested the sale of the option to repurchase the stock in the hands of the syndicate as a means of settling with the creditors. The syndicate was offered the option for $125,000. Willett under pressure from his lawyers consented to give them full authority to act for him. Nevertheless, he returned in a few days to Boston, and made a last desperate attempt to purchase the option himself at the price at which it was offered to the syndicate. This failed and on March 24, 1919, Willett released all his claims "from the beginning of the world" to that date, and the syndicate became owners of properties that have earned since that time more than a million dollars per year.

Thus, in the meagrest possible outline, is recast the story of a conspiracy case, contained in over 170 volumes of testimony, and into whose vortex is drawn the conduct of leading bankers of a great city. Duplicity, avarice, "keen, calculating business judgment," are indelibly stamped across these pages. Such a conspiracy does not spring full-grown from the brain of Jove, but emerges slowly as circumstances disclose opportunities to be grasped and pressed to fruition. How much of this is due to the high pressure of modern finance, how much is referable solely to the particular individuals concerned, must be left to a wider jury than the twelve ordinary men of the vicinage who enforced the community's standard against financiers and a financial lawyer.

The Willett case is but the first chapter in the yet unwritten history of how another field of activity, that of business credit, may be brought under legal control. What the case portends the future will tell. A combination of this type is certainly not unique in the business affairs of this country. Their operation, however, is always concealed by the intricate and elusive methods necessarily incident to complex business transactions. Every lawyer knows that conspiracy is one of the most difficult wrongs to prove.

Another Willett may not be able to have such persistent and fearless counsel—Whipple, Jones, Hall, Proctor—to press his cause, acquire the mass of evidence that a case of this type necessitates, weave together these infinite details in such a way as to disclose and prove the existence of a conspiracy. And other judges, other juries, cannot give eighteen months to the trial of a single cause. To society the just claim of one hundred dollars is as important as ten million. The common law through Willett has accepted the challenge. It remains to be seen whether its boast of eternal adaptability is an empty one.

FELIX FRANKFURTER.
JAMES M. LANDIS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Interallied Debts

MOST of the politicians and business men of America—but not all of them—tell us that they look on the interallied debts just as on any ordinary commercial debt for goods sold and delivered. We in Great Britain are acting on that principle. The United States have asked us to pay, and we are paying. Nevertheless there are three sufficient reasons for not treating France and Italy in like manner—the origin of the debts, the evils which would follow on an attempt to exact them, and the practical impossibilities of collection. I sympathize, therefore, with the distinction which M. Clementel, French Minister of Finance, has recently made in calling these debts "political" debts and other obligations of the French government "commercial debts."

Interallied debts are a matter of politics and not of law or contract. It is as mistaken to treat them as things of contract as it was to treat theoretical liabilities of Germany under the Treaty of Versailles as things of contract. If we consider for one minute the origin of the debts it is obvious they are not just like other debts. Let me put the argument as it may reasonably appeal to a Frenchman.

Each of the Allies threw the whole of its strength into the struggle—it was, as Americans say, a hundred percent war. But—wisely and properly—they did not all use their strength in the same way. For example, the effort of France was mainly military. On account of the number of men she put into the field in proportion to her population and because part of France was occupied by the enemy, France did not possess after the first year sufficient economic strength to equip her armies and to feed her people as well as to fight. Great Britain's military effort, though very great, was not so great as that of France; but our naval effort was much greater than hers, and our financial effort also was far greater since it fell on us—until America came into the War—to use our wealth and our industrial strength to help to equip and feed other allies. America's effort on the other hand was mainly financial. Both absolutely and in proportion to her population her military effort measured by the number of men she placed in the field and by her casualties—important though it was to the result—was on an altogether small scale. On the other hand the part which America played in equipping and feeding the Allies was enormous and we couldn't without such help have won the War. Thus each Ally made essential contributions to the result. But they did not all make them in the same way. Now it has never occurred to us or to America to charge France and Italy for British or American shells fired off from British or American guns. Yet when British or American shells were fired off from French or Italian guns the real cost to us or to America was much less since France and Italy supplied the gunners, suffered the casualties and are paying the pensions. Yet in this case we propose to charge France and Italy for the shells. In fact when American men, guns and shells had time to reach the front so that France was wholly relieved within the sector which they took over, there is no idea in anyone's mind that France should be charged the money for the aid which America thus gave her. When Great Britain sent men as well as supplies to the Italian front there is no idea of charging Italy anything. But when American men and guns had not reached the front and only American shells or American wheat or American gasoline had reached the French armies so that France had to find the men to use the equipment and to suffer the human losses, then France is to pay for the shells, wheat and gasoline. There is no rhyme or reason in this—no justice or commonsense.

Why then were these sums lent instead of being given outright at the beginning which would have saved all this trouble? There was at the time excellent reason against this—namely, that if money had been given outright it would certainly have promoted extravagance and lack of responsibility in spending. A large part of the financial conduct of the war consisted in establishing financial controls, that is, in preventing one department or one ally from spending sums out of the limited total resources available which could be spent to better advantage by another department or ally. It was hard enough for the Treasury to control our own spending departments and it was impossible except indirectly to control spending in departments of our Allies. If every official of the allied governments down to those with the least feeling of responsibility and the least power of imagination had known that it was someone else's money he was spending the incentives to economy would have been even less than they were. I have had no connection with the British Treasury for several years. But I am sure that their dealings with the Allies during the War were in the main directed to the enforcement of necessary economy and to see to the finish that our limited resources were spent to the best advantage. These transactions were not looked on at the time in the light of investments, or commercial advances. And I am sure that the same was true of the American Treasury. If the American public now think that in 1917 and 1918 they were engaged not in war but in investment their memories are very short.

But apart from the history of the debts the attempt to exact them now will have no other result than to breed international ill-will. We should just have the German reparation problem over again between each of the former Allies. Hatred and dissension and—in my belief—not even money would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be the result of trying to collect this sum year by year for a generation. Not even money—for France not only believes conscientiously that justice does not require her to pay and also that she cannot pay, but payment in full would in view of the history of the German reparations so deeply outrage her most genuine feelings that she would not do it even if it were in her interest.

For let us look at the demand in relation to the Dawes scheme. If France were to pay interest on the sinking fund, even at a low rate of interest on what she owes to us and to the United States, it would come to rather more than sixty million pounds a year which is almost exactly equal to the *whole* of France's share of the German reparations under the Dawes scheme on the assumption that this scheme works out in full. Does anyone believe France in whatever circumstances or under whatever threats will agree to hand over to Great Britain and the United States every penny she gets from Germany and perhaps more?

What then ought we to do? Looking back I believe it would have been an act of statesmanship and wisdom on the part of Great Britain if on the day of armistice we had announced to our Allies that all they owed us was forgiven from that day. It is not so easy to take that line now. For one thing we ourselves have undertaken to pay America a half million dollars every weekday for sixty years and day by day we are paying it. This sum is equivalent to two thirds of the cost of our navy and nearly equal to the total of our state expenditure on education. It is more than the whole of the profits of all our merchant ships and all our coal mines added together. With an equal sacrifice over an equal period we could abolish slums and rehouse our population in comfort. That we should pay on this scale and not be paid ourselves must influence our attitude. Therefore the idea that America should get better terms from France than we get because of her brusquer attitude is for good reasons intolerable to British opinion. It is impossible now for us to forgive the debts of France and of Italy unless America does the same. We cannot tolerate even a suggestion that America whom we are paying should get better terms than we get from those who owe us both.

A frank discussion between Great Britain and America must therefore be the first step to a settlement. And if I may make a suggestion as to the lines of compromise which such a settlement might take, it is this: to let a certain moderate proportion of what France and Italy may receive from Germany each year out of payments made under the Dawes scheme be devoted to the payment of French and Italian debts to their Allies; let these sums be divided between Great Britain and the United States in the proportion of what each is owed; and let this be in final discharge. It is not appropriate to invite France to make an offer as the American Debt Funding Commission is now doing. For this is merely to ask France to expose herself to humiliation. But if Great Britain and the United States could agree together to make to her a proposal on the above lines—say one-third of what she may receive from Germany from time to time thereafter—there is a chance of an honorable settlement.

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES.

London (by cable).

The Tragedy of Eugene O'Neill

NO other American writing today has so many ardent well-wishers as Eugene O'Neill. In part this is because he has been our only dramatist; in part, perhaps, because something in his work peculiarly comes home to us. But our feeling toward him is not pure gratitude; it is mixed with a sense, not only that he is possessed of extraordinary powers, but that somehow he has hitherto been prevented from making the most of those powers. For that reason—because we are aware of a kind of greatness in the man which has never yet achieved full expression, and because what he has to say is of importance to us—we approach each new play of his in a prayerful attitude, offering supplications that this time he may have been enabled to produce work which will fulfill our hopes of him. These hopes are still deferred, for now Desire Under the Elms has come, and it is not what we longed for. It is but the most typical of his plays so far.

It is the bleakest of his tragedies, which are all remarkable for bleakness. The older writers of tragedy give us some compensation, slight though it be; their protagonists go down to defeat, of course, but they go down in a blaze of glory. There is recompense for their defeat if only in our sense of their greatness; and more often than not their outward defeat is atoned for by their winning a spiritual victory. But that is not the modern point of view: the modernist sees man as a more passive victim, as only a subordinate part of nature, the sport of incomprehensible and meaningless forces within and without himself. Some of the moderns, to be sure, do not leave us altogether without alleviation. In Hardy, for instance, although life is wanton and cruel and futile, there is something redeeming in humanity; however bad according to human notions the universe may be, at least in some men and women there is a saving beauty and nobility. Or in Dreiser, if there is little to be said even for humanity, one finds at any rate a huge gusto for experience.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG .
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

O'Neill, however, like the majority of his contemporaries, denies us even these poor mitigations. Not only does he show us man as victim, victim of life, of nature, of circumstance, of other men, of self, but he also shows us man as undergoing an inner defeat. For the defeat his protagonists suffer is spiritual; they end in a spiritual frustration, a spiritual failure. His favorite theme is the degradation and disintegration of character. Everything is pitted against the individual. That he has bad luck is the least of his troubles. Sometimes he is broken by the forces of external nature, as when the Emperor Jones reverts to savagery and is finally crushed by the sheer weight of the tropic night. Sometimes society is the hostile victor, as it destroys the Hairy Ape when he refuses to be a mere slave to a machine. But always the interest is centred on the mental process of the victim, and usually the destructive force is an inner one: the mind goes to pieces because of its own inner conflict. The disruptive agency in All God's Chillun is race-prejudice; in many plays it is avarice or sex, both of which figure conspicuously in Desire Under the Elms. But perhaps Beyond the Horizon, with its three-fold failure due partly to luck, somewhat more to external nature, but most of all to sex, best illustrates this aspect of O'Neill's tragedy.

Such a tragic world is not only deterministic, but also pessimistic: everything is predetermined for the worst. This grimness O'Neill does nothing to relieve—not that every one of his plays is utter gloom, for at least he is not a misanthrope. But the most one can say is that the dramatist treats his poor creatures with pity, not with contempt. He deals by preference with the disinherited. Almost without exception he portrays only the more unfortunate among farmers and laborers. Peasants, sailors, stokers, prostitutes, negroes—these are his types, as his locale is the sea, the unproductive farm, and the slum. Yet the point about these folk is less that they have been denied the good things of the world than that they have been denied life itself. In some of them the lack is innate, but not in many; their difficulty is not feebleness so much as malnutrition. They are stunted, thwarted, starved, like trees that try to grow in a bad soil and a bitter climate. The characters of Desire Under the Elms are extreme instances—sucked dry, perverted and obscene, denuded of every humane impulse, balked of any healthy growth, left with only hatred, greed, and lust, they are worm-eaten fruit which rots while still green because it never has a chance to ripen.

O'Neill's world, then, is obviously restricted in scope; but it is not that only—it is also meagre and scanty in substance. In part this leanness is due to the materials with which he works. Bread cannot be made with bran and sawdust, and a dramatic world of human abundance cannot be created out of dehumanized human beings. For another reason, however, his world lacks fullness of body. It is not fully created; it is not an independent, self-sufficient, opaque, three-dimensional affair in which solid, fully existing men and women move about. Seldom does he give us that complete realization, complete illusion of actuality, which distinguishes the first act of Anna Christie and the early one-act masterpiece, The Moon of the Caribbees. Than the latter, indeed, we could ask no better example of the quality lacking in his later work. This little piece has no plot; it is just a scene of drunkenness and lust in the tropic night under the full moon with negroes chanting in the distance. It is sordid, not at all prettified, yet intensely poetic, with the poetry of a thing intensely realized, intensely imagined, and vividly rendered.

One reason why this complete realization is rare in his work may be that O'Neill has the type of mind which begins with an abstract theme and works from that to the concrete. If true, this would account for much—for the fact that, as The Straw and The First Man bear witness, without a strong and simple theme he is lost. His people alone are not of enough interest to carry the play; in fact, in and of themselves, apart from what happens to them, they would cause us little concern or curiosity. Again, it would account for the fact that his growing tendency has been away from the concrete toward the abstract, that his constant development has been from the creative toward the schematic. Even in his best play, The Hairy Ape, Yank remains more of a symbol than a person. One reason why O'Neill was the first American playwright to join the anti-realistic reaction called expressionism may be that the newer technique offered him a line of less resistance than the old, gave him an excuse to slight the arduous process of creation. In All God's Chillun, for instance, he has solved several of his problems by means of devices which are too facile and mechanical.

Besides his inclining to abstraction, however, there are other signs that his creative power is not so strong as it might be. From the beginning he has never given us subtle and complex characterization. Always he has dealt in characters of one syllable, his delineation has been notably simple, stressing one or two traits only, expressing the simplest of emotions, requiring the actor's presence to fill in the outline; but at its best this delineation has been bold and clear, like a strong sketch. In her review of Beyond the Horizon, Miss Lola Ridge commented that the characters were not fully projected, not independent; they exist only as sketches, not in the round. This, of course, is a matter chiefly of the dialogue, since it is primarily by means of dialogue that characterization is accomplished; and O'Neill's dialogue, though for the most part adequate, is rarely more than adequate. That is to say, it does not often have that felicity of expression which startles one by its aptness and inevitability and which is the unmistakable mark of a writer with the creative faculty. At times in O'Neill's best work we get utterances which bear the absolute stamp of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the speaker's personality, such as the Emperor Jones's "I wants action when I spends" or Yank's "Hell, sure, dat's my fav'rite climate. I eat it up! I git fat on it!" It is noteworthy that only in the vernacular and in dialect is O'Neill successful, and that he is most successful with the most inarticulate characters, in whom we expect an incomplete and impeded utterance.

Another of his limitations is in his capacity for emotional expression. That he himself takes his world hard, feels it intensely, need not be said; it is his evident claim to greatness. Even his failures are conceived in passion. Nor does he fail to communicate his feeling to us—he possesses real tragic power. But sometimes he cares too much; he loses command of his feeling, and in his wish to drive it home, to rub our noses in the human misery which outrages him, he goes so far that we revolt and in our reaction withdraw our belief, as at the end of Diff'rent. Suicide and madness are ticklish matters; for them to be credible to us, we must be worked up as strongly as the dramatis personæ, the feelings of the characters must be fully communicated to us. In most of O'Neill's plays—all indeed except The Hairy Ape and The Emperor Jones—there comes a moment when an emotional pitch is reached beyond which the writer does not carry us. From then on, the feelings of the characters are not communicated to us, and the play seems to dissolve in hysterics.

All this is merely to say that O'Neill's execution does not equal his conception. As Mr. Lewisohn has said of him, he "conceives his actions powerfully and philosophically," but "the moment he begins to write, he abandons the leadership of his conception." The latter statement is too extreme, but it points to a truth—that the vigor with which O'Neill begins does not last out the piece, that he cannot long sustain the pressure of creation. And when this pressure begins to flag, all sorts of disasters happen. His people no longer work out their own destiny; they seem as obviously managed as marionettes. They take refuge in hysteria, and the dramatist flees to sensationalism, sentimentality, and theatricalism. Of all his plays, the best example of such disintegration is Desire Under the Elms. In it, the chief characters shift and break up before our eyes. They who have been hard and bitter grow soft, sentimental, and relatively commonplace. They say and do things utterly unlike themselves. Before the end, we become incredulous and indifferent.

The strange thing is that we feel these flaws as mere aberrations, not as inherent and pervasive defects of O'Neill's imagination. That is why, with the announcement of each new play, we hope again that at last he may be able to bring it off, that this time his execution will be worthy of his conception. A certain meagreness there is bound to be in his work; the imaginative diet which he offers us can never be highly nourishing, for we cannot live long at a time in a world so hostile to life as his. But he is salutary and bracing, like a northeast wind; he is a corrective, a bitter herb. And he has so much power that we long for him to use it to the full. If we search for an explanation of his incomplete success, we find a suggestive parallel between his picture of the world and his own difficulties as a writer. Concerning his characters he has emphasized two things: one, that they are starved for lack of the food of life; the other, that they are unable in any way to control their lives. But these are the very qualities which O'Neill's writing also shows; he is unable to master and to control his inspiration, so that his plays go to pieces, and his power of characterization is somewhat lean and scant, as if his imagination had not been sufficiently fed. That is, to judge by his work, O'Neill is in these two respects like his own creatures. But this is natural enough; it is simply to say that O'Neill has drawn as every writer must on his own experience, or better, that his work is conditioned, perhaps unconsciously, by his own experience.

Lack of control is probably innate, but is not unconquerable; lack of proper nourishment for the imagination presents a greater difficulty, for it indicates that the trouble is not in the writer but in his environment. O'Neill has given us little direct criticism of his environment; he is not a social critic, concerned with local and temporary conditions, but a writer of tragedy concerned with fundamental and elemental themes. An instructive analogy to his case, however, is afforded by most of his contemporaries, of whom many offer explanations in the form of explicit social criticism.

In the first place, the tragedy of spiritual frustration is used as a literary theme not by O'Neill alone. On the contrary, it is for some reason the favorite topic of current writers. O'Neill is but one of many who have chosen to depict the defeated and the stunted, the famished for lack of vital nutriment. Not even in Desire Under the Elms is human nature more debased than in The Spoon River Anthology—scarcely more so than in Winesburg, Ohio. E. A. Robinson and Robert Frost present pictures of human decay and distortion as terrible as Diff'rent or Beyond the Horizon. Willa Cather's subject is commonly the struggle, often unsuccessful, to survive and grow in unfavorable surroundings, and the Lost Lady is lost because she is denied the materials for proper living. Finally, the most detailed picture we have of a community "where life at its most passionate is but a low-grade infection" is Gopher Prairie, unless it is the city of Zenith where George F. Babbitt is baffled in his search for a satisfactory life. But the list could be continued indefinitely, for every season numerous novels are published with this as their thesis. Nor do most of these writers fail to avow that their work is direct criticism of life as lived in the United States. Whereas O'Neill places the trouble chiefly within the individual, the others see it as a conflict between individual and environment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spiritual frustration, then, is not only the specific tragic theme of modern American literature, but also—if we may believe our writers—the all but universal condition of American life. From Maine to Colorado it is the same story; hardly a state or a social class—not the city nor the town nor the country—escapes the indictment. The testimony is universal that, in Van Wyck Brooks's words, "the individual as a spiritual unit invariably suffers defeat" in the United States. Such a chorus is hardly to be ignored. We cannot well accuse Robert Frost and Miss Cather and Sinclair Lewis of being inaccurate observers, nor, taking them with all the rest, can we say that the criticism is based on a narrow range of observation. Furthermore, there is a tone of asperity in much contemporary writing which suggests that the authors are not drawing on observation alone—that they have themselves suffered, and suffered vitally, from the conditions they depict. They, it is true, have not been defeated, for they have done good work; but they seem to have felt their environment as hostile to their development.

As to why this should be so—what there is in American life which is unfriendly to human growth—explain it as you like; we are concerned with its relation to O'Neill. If the diagnosis of our critics is correct, it explains much—not O'Neill's tragic genius, of course, but the limitations which hamper that genius. If his dramatic world is narrow and meagre, his characterization incomplete, if his imagination is not hale and robust, it is because that imagination, feeding upon a devitalized life, a life inimical to human values, suffers from undernourishment. He has instinctively come to portray human existence as a tragedy of spiritual frustration because that aspect of existence has been most conspicuous in his surroundings. Perhaps he feels this type of tragedy so keenly because he has felt it threatening himself, because he has not passed through unscathed. It may even be, also, that we follow his work with so much interest because his theme touches something fundamental in ourselves, because unconsciously we feel a common bond between ourselves and the folk of his creation—because his tragedy is ours as well.

T. K. WHIPPLE.

Complete Sex-Transformation in Adult Animals

THE recent demonstration of complete sex-reversal in adult animals provides occasion for a revision of some of our thoughts and views. One more element of supposed fixity in nature has become fluid, or at least plastic. The public lends ear and takes notice because the new fact invades a field in which it has perhaps not doubted the correctness and adequacy of its own impressions. To the biologist the new fact brings a somewhat different attitude toward the amount of possible experimental interference in the development of a wide range of hereditary characters.

If a change of sex has been satisfactorily proved in even a single adult higher animal a fact of far-reaching consequence has been established. The bearing and importance of this result can be made clear by a brief consideration of some points involved in our present knowledge of sex. Everyone knows that we find the two sexes—two different types of organisms—represented within most species of animals and plants. Even to the special student of sex, however, the basis or real cause of this dual form of a species is not yet entirely clear. We do know how heredity usually operates in order to assure nearly equal numbers of these two sexes. Studies made during the past twenty years have shown that two kinds of germ cells are formed by one of the parents—in some species this is done by the male, in others by the female; further, that these two kinds of cells are differently provided with chromosomes, and each kind of fertilized cell usually results in a male or female embryo according to its chromosomal equipment. Sex then is normally fixed and inherited in essentially the same way as is stature, color and other hereditary characteristics.

From the preceding statements two things become evident: In the same way that the chromosomal equipment of the fertilized egg normally decides the sex of the individual it also decides his stature, temperament, color, intellect, resistance to diseases, features, and many other things. Again, if any one of these chromosomally determined characters can be completely reversed or transformed (to an alternative or recessive state also latent in his chromosomes) in an individual then all hereditary characters of this type are also theoretically transformable; the further task therefore, is the practical—not the impossible—one of learning how to effect the transformation of each of them at will. If the transformability of sex alone were involved the cases to be discussed here would provide a wide basis of public and scientific interest.

We may now turn to the question, is sex in adult animals—and in humans—irrevocably fixed, or is it reversible? This particular question has been answered recently and the solution of the problem is contained in the following account of three cases in which a reversal of sex has been properly demonstrated. It can be stated at once that the three

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cases to be described by no means exhaust the available evidence for the reversible nature of sex. These three cases are properly tested and accredited cases of reversal in adult animals and are therefore the severest tests of the possibility of reversing sex in any stage of its development or existence. Investigations carried on during several years have convinced the writer that within the practical limitations of our present methods sex can be rather readily changed or reversed in the earliest or egg-stage of the pigeon; and it is believed that many such cases of sex-reversal have been induced at this earliest period. Conditions in a full grown animal are such, however, that a "natural" reversal of sex can be expected only as a rare occurrence. In order that this rare occurrence, when actually encountered, may be recognized for what it really is it is necessary that a competent investigator shall have obtained and recorded certain kinds of crucial evidence for both of the sex stages of the transformed individual. The necessary facts have been reported for one case among the salamanders, another for the fowl, and still another for the pigeon. The last-named case was actually the first to be demonstrated in point of time, but it was most recently described and will be reserved for the last place in this description.

Champy, a French investigator, was able to show that severe fasting, if practised on male Triton during the summer may result in two interesting changes which are apparently the same changes as result from castration. First, these males lose the power to form male cells or sperms in the next expected period for their formation. Second, such males lose their distinctively male characteristics and assume a "neuter" condition. This is a condition unlike that of the female and is normally assumed by males during the winter. During the spring of 1920 Champy noted that some of the males thus castrated during the previous summer no longer possessed male glands of normal appearance but had in their stead two elongated masses of fat. In a later study two males which had been severely fasted during the summer of 1920, and after an interval of two months had been intensively renourished, were found during the following winter to have assumed not merely the "neuter" condition but a distinctly female appearance. One of these "males" was killed in January, 1921, and was found to have glands rather like those earlier seen in the neuter males—fatty tissue containing cells that were "indifferent" but not of definitely ovarian nature. The other male Triton was allowed to live for a longer period and thus became the salamander of interest to the present story.

That this particular salamander was in fact a male before the beginning of the experiment seems to have been satisfactorily proved. During the spring preceding its fasting period it had been a normal male in appearance; it was isolated with a single female Triton and fertilized the eggs of this female; the eggs thus fertilized by it developed normally. At the time of this test this animal was a mature male.

In early February the appearance of this male had been so altered that it could not be distinguished from a typical female. It was killed, however, only after the period of mating and egg-laying had been reached—in April. The interesting and decisive point was of course the condition of its germ glands. To ordinary observation these seemed to be ovaries and their microscopic study demonstrated beyond doubt that they no longer contained sperms or male tissue, but were filled with immature eggs—a condition quite like that found in the ovary of a very young female.

In a word, this mature male was now in possession of the germ glands of an immature female.

The second case of this narrative is that of a hen which became a rooster. The case was recently observed and described by Dr. Crew of the University of Edinburgh. A native householder had kept this Buff Orpington hen until she was three and one-half years old for purposes of egg-laying and the rearing of her own young. Six months before the bird was first brought under the observation of Dr. Crew it had ceased to lay and soon developed signs of disease. When obtained by him the bird was still a nearly normal hen in appearance, though a developing tendency to crow had made it objectionable to the former owner. During the twenty-two months this bird was under competent observation its health was restored, the comb notably enlarged and spurs were developed from the merest rudiments to nearly two inches in length. The bird also assumed the plumage as well as the mating and fighting behavior of a cock. It unhesitatingly fought with cocks and was attentive to hens. At this point the microscope proved that "it" was producing live sperm. It was then mated to a virgin Buff Orpington hen, fertilized two eggs, and thus became the father of two young—a male and a female. These latter were inter-bred and produced typical Buff Orpington chickens.

The autopsy of this fowl, sick but dead of accident in December, 1922, revealed an extensive tuberculous infection of the liver, gizzard, intestine and ovary. The single duct which leads ova to the exterior had almost disappeared and two vessels for conducting the sperm were present. Two testes of normal dimensions, and with even outlines and surfaces were found. A complete and conclusive account of the microscopic appearance of the nearly destroyed ovary and of the two well-developed testes has also been published. Dr. Crew discusses the condition of this bird after it ceased laying in the following terms:

In the autumn of 1920 she began to suffer from ovarian disease, which became noticeable in January, 1921. The disease was tuberculosis of the ovary, which progressively removed the ovarian tissue and so produced the effects of pathological

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ovariotomy. But it would seem that this tumor growth in its effects so altered the general metabolism of the individual that the conditions favorable to the differentiation and growth of spermatic tissue were created."

In this instance therefore adequate observation has preserved an odd item of history pertaining to this mercurial age. At least one dimly-lighted intelligence of our time has achieved both motherhood and fatherhood of a noisy, persistent and fruitful portion of the life of the earth.

Our third case of complete sex-transformation is that of a female ring-dove which became a male under the observation of the present writer. At the beginning there was nothing to indicate that this bird was at all unlike some thousands of other female doves and pigeons which have been studied by us during a period of thirteen years. Since all of these birds were bred, kept and observed as a part of a prolonged study of sex it happens that we are in possession of all the facts necessary to a demonstration of sex-reversal in this case.

Several kinds of information recorded for this particular bird show that at first she was a normal female. She laid eleven eggs between January 27 and April 15, 1914. These eggs were carefully examined and details concerning each of them were recorded; even the time of laying of each of these eggs was recorded to within an hour, and the weight of each of the contained yolks was recorded. She laid her last egg on April 15. When, however, the proper time arrived at which she should lay another pair of eggs she promptly took the nest —but laid no eggs! The eggs of another dove were therefore offered for her care. She and her male mate hatched these eggs, fed them normally for six days, and then deserted them. This entire performance was twice repeated during the autumn of 1914. Shortly afterward, February, 1915, she assumed the sex behavior of a male dove and even repeatedly forced her male mate to assume the attitude of a female in the actual act of mating. Still later the former female developed the crow of the cock pigeon. Many similar observations were made and recorded which of course need not be repeated here. Meanwhile the body weight of the bird had increased so that the size came to be more nearly that of the male dove.

Forty-four months after this bird had laid her last egg she died (December 29, 1917), showing an advanced tuberculous infection of other organs of the body, particularly of the spleen and liver. If any trace of the ovary still existed at this time it was quite lost in the cheesy tuberculous masses which involved these particular organs. Two well-formed testes were found, however, in their normal position. The left testis was somewhat heavier than the right—a fact which we think reflects the earlier history of femininity. The pervading tuberculosis which had resulted in death had, as in all similar cases seen by us, reduced the size of the male organs; but the bird was unquestionably a male at death.

The evidence gathered indicates that tuberculosis began to destroy the germ gland of this bird soon after the last eggs were laid in April, 1914. Also, that eventually this disease completely destroyed the ovarian tissue and that the regenerating tissue formed not ovarian but testicular tissue. It is wholly probable that the progress of the tuberculosis was practically completely stopped as soon as the single left ovary—there is normally only one ovary in pigeons and fowls—was suppressed. Much later the same disease attacked other organs and killed the bird; during the intervening years our records indicate a healthy masculine bird. Unfortunately this bird was never given a female mate.

It will be noted that the fowl and the dove were both sexually transformed under the influence of the same localized disease and that both were changed from female to male. We may note further that the bodily conditions, or technically the "metabolic rate," which results from tuberculosis in the organism is known to approach the condition which my own earlier studies have shown to be typical or necessary for the development of the male sex but adverse to the development of the female sex.

It remains to mention a fact reported only a few months ago by the French observer, Benoit. This investigator removed the single left ovary from two young chicks when four and twenty-six days old; when the birds were several months old it was found that they had the spurs and combs of cocks and were each developing testicular tissue on the *right* side of the body. The present writer has obtained much evidence that for some reason not yet entirely clear the right side of the body of the pigeon is more favorable than is the left for the growth of testicular tissue; and is also less favorable for the growth of ovarian tissue. We can thus understand why the right ovary begins to develop in the embryos of birds but undergoes atrophy at the time of hatching. We can also see why *two* testes were developed in the sex-reversed fowl and pigeon although probably only a single ovary was present and subject to attack and destruction by disease.

Without further pursuing the rather difficult subject last approached we may suggest that so close is the relation borne by sex to the metabolic rate that in some organisms the full normality of the sex gland itself may be affected by the position it occupies in the body. This may seem an astounding conclusion; but it is more than suspected that a complete exploration of the number of things which affect sex development, even when they do not transform it, will abound in surprises.

The cases that have been described are regarded as a definite demonstration of the actual occurrence of complete sex-transformation in adult animals. The newly perceived fact of the transformability of sex will doubtless become a foundation for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establishment of a sound body of knowledge to be applied to the control and to the maintenance of the sex characteristics themselves. The application of this principle of developmental control or transformability to other hereditary characters is of still greater importance. Since the knowledge acquired of one truly hereditary character—sex—now enables us in the case of some animals to force this character to develop into its alternative or opposite form, a large measure of experimental control over numerous, possibly all, alternative hereditary characters becomes a realizable possibility. No such character—physical or mental in man or other organisms—can now be considered irreversible during the life term of the individual. It does not follow that the hereditary factors—the chromosomal representatives—are transformed, nor that the character-transformation at all affects the succeeding generations.

OSCAR RIDDLE.

An Interview with a Young Lady

"I MUST make good," she was saying. "I simply must." And I, looking at her, was tempted to remark: "Young lady, you have already made good." For so it seemed to me. Indeed I meditated at some length upon the interesting miracle of how a cocoon of the opposite sex quite unaccountably makes good even while devoting all of her conscious effort in other directions. And I found the fact not entirely fair.

But I asked: "Why must you make good?" The question did not so much puzzle as astonish her. Evidently the answer was clear enough to the young lady but a person who would ask such a question was incomprehensible. She stared at me.

"Have you brothers?" I asked. And so it developed that she had brothers who had made good. Also many acquaintances, some boys, some girls, all struggling to make good. I gathered that girls couldn't possibly contemplate matrimony until they had made good—and perhaps not even then. Only admitted dullards, it seemed, clutched at early marriage.

"But what is early marriage?" I asked. Well, it seemed to be marriage under the age of twenty-five. I silently meditated the fact that this means a girl should remain single for not less than ten years after she has achieved physical womanhood. In the case of a young man that would be rather trying. However, assuming the young lady's marriage at twenty-five it means she will be forty-six years of age when her first child is twenty.

"Do you like children?" I asked.

"They are impossible if a woman is to have her career."

"But do you like children?"

"I hate them." This was said impetuously, and I so judged that it probably meant the same thing as "I love children."

"Many men and women have both children and careers," I ventured. To which she replied: "I shall never marry."

"And what," I asked, "is the objective of this high resolve? What do you wish to do?"

Well, it seemed that the young lady wished to write. Had she ever written anything? Yes, and here it was; offered with appalling confidence, I thought, in view of the usual fate of these early fruits. I read the pages with dismay, for each paragraph barred a pathway leading out of my present embarrassment. Obviously the young lady wrote well. Also, obviously, the young lady had not a great deal to say but time and experience may be depended upon to wipe out that deficiency—after collecting their customary toll.

Here, of course, one confronts the crux of the matter, for it impinges upon the question of toll. Would the young lady care to pay the toll? Also should the young lady pay the toll? Now, at her age, I had not made good in any way nor in any degree. I was more of a fool than totally uneducated young men of my own age, also I was not physically a man. But the person before me, it was plain to be seen, had achieved the estate of womanhood, so that in one way at least she had already made good. The floundering years that I paid as instalments upon the toll demanded by Time and Experience were of no great value to me or anyone else—at least that is my present estimate. But the young lady before me had no such years in her wallet. That is the queer thing about young ladies, one day they are squalling infants, and the next day they are royal princesses with the appalling result that never are they equipped with the sort of brass coins I so cunningly foisted upon Time and Experience. They, for their part, first have no coins at all, and then suddenly come into possession of gold in vast quantities. Indeed, it often happens that they begin life by receiving their entire estate in cash so that they travel perilously through the world, dogged by a slinking gray figure with horrible designs upon the security of their later years.

Suddenly the smile with which I had greeted the young lady's remark that she would never marry froze upon my lips, for over in the corner stood that gray figure, grinning in a manner not pleasing to contemplate.

"I realize the risk," continued the young lady, "but I am willing to pay the price and take my chances like a good sport."

Yes, that is the astounding fact about these modern young women; they are good sports. But they have only gold to play with while I learned to gam-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble, using matches for chips. I wanted to say to the young lady: "First, marry impetuously; suffer disillusion; prance off without reckoning the consequences; starve a few times; dally with extreme poverty; write a lot of rot in which you are the heroine; then wake up some day and laugh at it. By that time you will begin to see the world objectively; eventually you may produce something worth while. In short, the apprenticeship ranges from five to ten years, with probability pointing to the latter term." I wanted also to say: "Very little art work of any note is produced by virgins, either male or female. This, of course, is because a virgin has not achieved maturity."

It is absurd, but I couldn't say that to the young lady. Under the circumstances imagine my astonishment when I heard her remark: "I shall take a lover, of course, because I realize that I am a woman." Yes, she said that. This new generation with its frankness quite causes my hair to rise on end.

"I wish I might believe," said I, "that your alternative to marriage is certain of success but such is not the case. Strange as it may seem to you I, too, once contemplated a short cut to maturity while avoiding the entanglements of matrimony. The young goddess who was to have been my partner in this enterprise had in mind the same desirable end. We understood each other perfectly, for several weeks. Eventually, having removed all doubt, I said to her, 'Today is the day,' and she replied: 'Darling, will you love me always?' So that was that, or in other words, women seem to be perversely female. You may live to discover some such quality in yourself. The fact that a man is your lover and not your husband will not prevent you from submerging yourself in him if it is your nature to do so nor will the lack of a piece of paper with gold seal upon it rob him of the attributes of his sex. In short, he will make demands upon you according to his nature which is as lawlessly uncertain as your own. Therefore, my young friend, there is no certainty either in or out of marriage, and I do not advise you one way or the other beyond telling you that certainty does not exist.

"There was a time," I continued, "when wives were expected to do much cooking, darning, washing, and child-bearing, while mistresses were exempted from these duties, but in the economic stratum in which you would probably marry wives are notoriously idle. You might find a husband even a more convenient beast of burden than a lover. That would be especially true if you care for children. Would you live with a man if you didn't love him? Just as a matter of temporary convenience?"

Her eyes flashed, and two words were fired at me. "Certainly not."

"That," I said, "was what I feared."

But she merely smiled, and talked on.

At first I did not hear all that she said because a certain imp that accompanies me everywhere began to make jokes. This imp is cynical about women. He was saying: "Oh, how funny you look this moment with your brows all puckered! Do you not see that this young woman has arrived at the mating age and is engaged in making herself attractive? They use all of the arts to their own unvarying end, you ridiculous male. She has no more desire to write than has your grandmother."

But I choked the imp, and meditated upon the fact that women have always produced art, and probably will continue to do so. The best test to apply when any person says: "I wish to write," consists of nothing more subtle than asking: "Have you written?" For an authentic wish is never sterile and seldom fallow. Thus, according to the best test I know, the young lady before me really wished to write—for she had written. Moreover, I was convinced that she possessed ability.

At this moment her voice again penetrated my meditation. What would I advise? she was asking. Now, this was a most disconcerting question, for what difference would it make whether I advised the one course or the other? I might as well counsel an infant not to breathe as admonish a writer not to write. Nature takes its course, along with its toll, in both cases. But the young lady was waiting for her answer.

"Well," I began uncertainly, "there are two serious defects in your argument. One is the statement that you have simply got to make good. No such compulsion rests upon any artist. Moreover, there are so many frightful possibilities in connection with the meaning of the phrase to make good that I dare not even ask you to define. The second defect in your argument is that you have asked for advice. It would be more natural for the writer, after some years of effort, to look at himself one morning, and remark with mild astonishment: 'So it turns out that I am a writer. I had been wondering just what I was.' In addition to these two defects in your argument I am also befogged by certain changes that have been going on in the world, especially those changes that have unsettled the place occupied by your sex. My eyes tell me that you have already made good and your mind tells you that you have not yet begun your effort. You are thus a mixture of natural processes with which I am quite familiar and new educational processes the effects of which are strange to me. It may be that the education of modern young women is still impregnated with a lot of ideas more applicable to young men, such as, for instance, making good. Or, on the other hand, it may be that we have entered a new era and that I am echoing the voices of men who did the world a service by retiring to their graves. Confronted with all these doubts I can think of but one safe course which is to request that you return about twenty years from now. By that time I may reach more stable conclusions. However, before dismissing you, I really would like to ask your opinion on one pertinent matter; namely, what do you think of the aphorism that 'nothing matters much?' "

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I think," said the young lady, with a spirited toss of her shapely head, "that a great many things matter. And I know that I simply must make good."

I rose from my chair.

"Are you going?" she asked.

"I am going to lunch," I replied. "And much to my disgust, I am going alone for I should like very much to enjoy the company of such a distinguished success as yourself. Experience warns me, however, that there is concealed about your person a flaming, screaming love affair destined to place its victims quite off their balance for several months. And the imp that accompanies me everywhere is this very minute tugging at my ear urging me to invite you to come along." So saying I opened the door very wide and held it open for a long time because the gray figure that had been huddled in the corner followed slowly after the beautiful young lady. On passing through the door this repulsive gray figure winked slyly and pointed. I observed with alarm that the very purse carried by the young lady was hanging open disclosing such an amount of gold that the display of it seemed positively indecent.

On the way to lunch I meditated as follows: "One of the parties to this recent interview talked like a fool, and I hope very earnestly that the fool is myself. For that young lady is going ahead, just as, at her age, I always did."

CHESTER T. CROWELL.

Maggie

"And we'll be rich when I come back,
When I come back, we'll wed."
And Maggie listened to his talk,
Half hearing what he said.

"When I come back, we'll build, we'll show 'em,
We'll set 'em all a-stare.
Good-bye, Maggie." "Speed you home,"
She whispered, half aware.

They heard her voice one angry night
And followed where it led
And found her wandering, wild and white.
"He's dead," she cried, "he's dead."

All she would tell them was a moan,
"He lay there in my bed,
His lips were cold as any stone,
He's dead, he's dead.

"For every time I close my eyes,
I see him come to me
And put his arms out weariful,
Dripping with the sea."

"Poor Maggie thought that you were drowned,"
They said when he was home
And showed him the place where she was found,
The sea-weed and the foam.

WITTER BYNNER.

Washington Notes

IT is, perhaps, too much to expect, but if the daily newspapers were half as interested in getting at the right and wrong of things here as they were, for instance, in the cigarette hole in Mrs. Scott's pink kimona, Mr. Coolidge would long ago have been driven from his utterly indefensible position on the sugar tariff. It is an outrageous absurdity that the game he is playing should continue without a real showing up. Every posted person knows he has not only equivocated and evaded this issue in a perfectly shameless way, but plans now not to reappoint Lewis, the low tariff Democrat, and means to reorganize the whole commission so as to secure a majority report for the increase he wants to make in the sugar schedule, instead of being placed in the painful position of taking the minority report. Apparently, he lacks the courage to do the thing without the commission's backing. It would be almost too raw to fly directly in the face of its recommendation.

The Robinson resolution, demanding an investigation of the whole business, and particularly of the alleged pressure put on certain members in this matter, may block the game, but it is doubtful. The press protection of the Executive is still so overwhelming that not much headway toward really mirroring the man can be made, and it is safe for him, in his solemn way, to do almost anything.

"Wait until Justice Holmes retires," said the hopeful friends of Secretary of the Navy Wilbur, immediately after the President named his Attorney General for the Supreme Bench in place of McKenna.

It developed right after the Stone announcement that Wilbur's name had been urged rather strongly upon the President, and that the Californian's friends came away full of confidence that their man would be named to fill the next vacancy.

This may or may not be well founded, but the certain thing is that the popularity of the Secretary is not increasing in the Senate, while the chances of a real fight against his confirmation are. The best guess is that, when Justice Holmes retires, Mr. Wilbur will stay where he is.

The persistence of the talk around Washington of the annual cost of maintaining the Mayflower as a presidential yacht, may seem a trifle petty, but whose fault is it? Even though it does run not far from three-quarters of a million dollars, there would have been no comment had it not been for the totally unnecessary lengths to which the planted publicity of that presidential trip to Chicago in the ordinary Pullman was carried and the unprecedented enthusiasm with which the Republican publicity agencies extolled the "example in economy set Congress by the President."

Under the circumstances, it is, perhaps, natural for a lot of Congressmen who find their "extravagance" continuously subjected to invidious comparisons with the "thrift" of the White House occupant, to ask pointedly, where is the consistency in a President who, for purposes of economy, declines to travel in a private car, but still maintains, at government expense, a private yacht, which he uses more frequently than any of his predecessors?

California politics are about as unpredictable as any in the country, but an interesting rumor recently came floating in from the West concerning the senatorial fight in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that state in 1926, when the term of the gay and garrulous Mr. Shortridge expires.

It is said that W. G. McAdoo will then make a grab for the Democratic nomination if there is anything like the good sized row in the Republican ranks there now promises to be. He is much too level-headed to think any Democrat can carry California without a Republican split. The fact is, though, a very real split seems likely. Hiram J. is still very much alive. His term does not end until 1928, and his spirit is neither contrite nor subdued. The intimation that Mr. Hoover has his eye on the Republican nomination for 1926 almost drives him insane.

It would be an amusing situation if McAdoo and Hoover, who are about equally anxious to be President, should be opposing senatorial candidates two years hence. It isn't, of course, probable, but wouldn't it be hard on Hiram?

There is a growing feeling in usually well-informed circles that the real influence at the White House is not William M. Butler of Massachusetts, but Dwight Morrow, of the House of Morgan.

It is true Mr. Morrow is not seen as much at the White House as Senator Butler, nor does he often figure among the guests on the week-end trips down the Potomac, but that he is in fairly constant touch with the President just the same there is not the slightest doubt. Some very good judges are convinced that, if there should come a test of strength, Morrow would out-pull the whole Massachusetts group—Butler, Weeks, Gillette and Stearns—not at all because he is a member of the Morgan firm, but merely because he is Morrow. The chances are, however, there will never be any such test. The Massachusetts men won't be on the other side. They will be on his side.

Not many accustomed to detect political drifts have any doubt that "Nick" Longworth will be speaker of the next House, regardless of the Madden fight. So far as a thing can be politically fixed this far in advance, that is fixed. There will be a considerable agitation over the matter. They will go through the motions of a real fight, but the administration forces are already lining up behind the Ohio man. His alliances, and those of the Roosevelt clan, are much too strong, and his personal popularity much too genuine and wide, for this thing toward which he has worked for nearly twenty years, to slip away from him now. The ridiculous rumor that he would be opposed by most of the Western Congressmen, because of their wives' jealousy of the aristocratic Alice, is one of those unimportant, if true, stories that are given almost daily circulation in Washington. As a matter of fact, Mrs. Longworth's support would help any candidate for almost any office.

Nor has the fact that the Longworths are expecting an increase in their family hurt his chances. Rather the reverse.

With the astute and zealous Gray Silver in Chicago instead of Washington, the American Farm Bureau organization, which wielded such undoubted force in the last two sessions of Congress, has unquestionably diminished in congressional influence. If they are really to get attention here, the farmers must be represented by men who combine the qualities of crusader and politician in about the same proportion that Silver did. They must not only know the legislative game, and have cut their political wisdom teeth, but they must have their hearts in the cause.

T. R. B.

Washington.

A COMMUNICATION

Canadian Railways

SIR: Permit me to express my general agreement with the article of Mr. Hugh L. Keenleyside in your issue of November 19. But as I possess a certain limited knowledge of—though by no means "a rather close acquaintance with"—the history of the several lines that compose the Canadian National System may I set forth below the chief points on which I beg to differ from him?

(*a*) The reference to "the extraordinarily foolish policy of the late Borden administration" is altogether unjust. It is generally recognized that the building of "bridge" lines through territory poor in local traffic was the major cause of subsequent difficulties. The building of the Grand Trunk Pacific-National Transcontinental was the chief plank of the Liberal party in the election of 1904 and upon that policy Sir Wilfrid Laurier was returned to power. Construction of the Canadian Northern lines to the Pacific coast was begun in July, 1910 and by August, 1911, the section from the seaboard to Kamloops was under way. The contract for the work from Edmonton to the summit of the Rockies was let in March, 1911, leaving only a link of some 260 odd miles to be undertaken in 1912. [Railway Age Gazette, March 31, 1911, p. 813. Feb. 4, 1916, pp. 210-12.] The subsidy on the Canadian Northern main line from Port Arthur east was a government measure put through the House of Commons in the week May 10 to 17, 1911, over the vehement protests of Mr. Borden, the Leader of the Opposition, that neither adequate notice of the bill nor information about the intended route were given and that the haste of the whole proceeding was little short of scandalous. [House of Commons Debates 1910-11, pp. 8704, 9255-94.] In short, the Borden Cabinet, when it came into office in the Fall of 1911, faced a fait accompli. It was too late to draw back without throwing both projects into liquidation.

(*b*) The Grand Trunk is by no means to be regarded as "an old and solid eastern institution." Overloaded with securities during the construction period it tottered into bankruptcy in 1860. In the reorganization which followed none of the worthless paper was wiped out. Instead, the charges for the ensuing 5-10 years were funded [Statutes of Canada, 25 Vict. 56] with the result that at the end of the moratorium the property was still hopelessly embarrassed. So it continued. Even the aggressive management of C. M. Hays in 1896 could do little for it. Its common stock, created in 1852, managed to pay, before its total extinction in 1921, a total dividend of one-quarter of one percent, and that in 1889. There were grave doubts as to the regularity of that payment. [O. D. Skelton. The Railway Builders:]

(*c*) No serious student now speaks of the firm of MacKenzie and Mann as "frenzied promoters." Certainly they were not backward in receiving governmental aid but why should they not be judged by the standards of their time?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As for their outstanding ability in construction and scrupulous honesty in the expenditure of funds entrusted to them, I can only refer to the most important public document bearing on this whole case, The Report of the Railway Inquiry Commission, 1917, and especially pp. LVIII-LXI. There it is shown, on the basis of sworn testimony and a complete audit of the books of the Canadian Northern and of MacKenzie and Mann Company, Limited, first, that the latter did not accept one dollar in cash as contractor's profit on contracts totalling $204,000,000 with the railway company which they controlled, second, that the costs of important sections of the Canadian Northern as against comparable sections of the G. T. P. and N. T. R. were $88,629 per mile on the Mountain section against $112,000 on the G. T. P. and $52,602 per mile east from Port Arthur against $93,735 on the N. T. R. from Winnipeg to Quebec.

(*d*) The statement that "when the war pressure ended in 1918 the Liberal and Progressive parties combined to force the government's hand and a Board of Directors appointed by Ottawa was placed in charge of both lines [the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern]" requires a certain modification. In point of fact the legislation of 1917 for the acquisition of the Canadian Northern which provided also for control over the Grand Trunk Pacific was the work of the Conservative Ministry before the formation of the Union Government. [House of Commons Debates, 1917, pp. 4022, 5123-94.]

The story of the Canadian National is not one that "can be briefly told." In its larger aspect it is integral with the whole history of the country, the history of an attempt to create a national group in defiance of geographic forces. State aid to railways and canals and a protective tariff have been the main means to this end. Present tendencies continuing, we may take it as proved by the Canadian National: (1) that given a responsible government of reasonable intelligence the management of a state-owned railway system can be given all necessary liberty for the proper direction of the property entrusted to it; (2) that such conditions are sufficient to attract managerial ability of the highest order. In this work the Canadian National is the successor of the earlier Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific. The former is now part of the National system; as for the latter . . . but that problem lies just over the horizon.

JOHN L. MACDONALD.

Cambridge, Mass.

Alone

On the thirteenth of September I heard a meadow lark singing—
There was frost on the flat and the elm by the house was bare:
"Victory! Victory! Victory!" high he was ringing,
Between two stubble fields, holding his plow to the air.

"Vireo, thistle bird, mourning dove, follow the flying
Tide of the sun to its new beaches. Old fields are sown.
Leave me my dream, my cold shore where no shadow is crying
Reap; for the weed is my weed and the stone is my stone.

DOROTHY LEONARD.

CORRESPONDENCE

Liberalizing the Y. M. C. A.

SIR: Mr. Sutherland's objections to my review of The Ethics of Capitalism by Rosebush do not disturb me in the least since (1) it is obvious that we belong to divergent schools of social thought and since (2) I have been amply substantiated in my position. I plead guilty of imputing motives to the author; no discriminating reader could do otherwise. I do so, furthermore, because I have been in a position to observe the force of this biographical sketch in dulling the critical faculties of some of those for whom these spurious doctrines were primarily formulated.

A comparison of the following quotations with the one cited by my critic disposes of his charge that I am unfair in alleging that the author opposes the reforms generally called for. Unionism is bad for it "tends to become a system of the closed shop" (p. 30); "the state must never give up the right to use the injunction in labor disputes" (p. 36); "a wage theory based on needs works havoc with every incentive to thrift" (p. 63); he demands "the rigid application of the Sherman Anti-trust act to labor monopolies" (p. 117); "misled by that splendid word 'coöperation,' the Methodist church adopted an economic program which . . . enrolled that great, splendid denomination under the banner of Sovietism" (p. 53). However, the full intent of the author can be gained only from reading the whole book and not from quotations.

It is deplorable that the Y should sponsor this book because, as admitted, "Mr. Rosebush is conservative in his economic theory," and the movement is already marking time because of its conservatism. Its published works that really challenge the weaknesses of the present social order are few in number and their effectiveness will be greatly reduced by The Ethics of Capitalism. As a member of the organization and one engaged in training its future leadership with the hope of liberalizing the Association for greater usefulness, I cannot view with equanimity the official circulation among its personnel of a book that purports to offer valid solutions to our perplexing social problems but that in reality is dangerously reactionary in social and economic outlook.

GUSTAV T. SCHWENNING.

Springfield, Mass.

The Here and the Hereafter

SIR: It seems to me that Mr. A. R. Orage (Religion in America, issue of Dec. 31) errs fundamentally when he gives a national aspect to what is really an economic phase of religion. He says that the emphasis on reformation instead of transformation is particularly American. In reality, such an emphasis exists not in any one nation but among all peoples that are economically prosperous.

Other-worldliness is a characteristic of beaten or slavish people. Christianity started among conquered Jews and Roman paupers; the liberals in the post-war reaction turned to the other worlds of literature and music; and old persons facing inevitable death look for immortality.

But to a prosperous nation, present possibilities overshadow vague futures. If we can have gold in our teeth, we don't hanker so much for golden streets. A victrola and radio counteract the thrill of a future harp. If we can get Schenectady by wireless, we don't care so much about getting a geographically vague promised land. If we can fly through the heavens, we are somewhat diverted from the desire to fly in Heaven.

Prosperity opens paths of reformation; hopeless adversity leads us to seek transformation into something different. Religious creeds are broad enough to include both aspirations. But as Mr. Orage says, the transformation of man is not a clearly followed aim in American religion. And, contrary to the statement of Mr. Orage, the church offers no ethical code for individual or social reformation today. There is a double failure, which cannot be concealed by resorts to advertising, pageants, music, movies, cross-word puzzles, and the endorsements of prominent millionaires.

W. L. WERNER.

State College, Penn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Geneva and Opium

SIR: In your editorial in the New Republic of December 31, The Opium Problem Postponed, you state that

> the second American demand was that among oriental native populations which smoke opium, the traffic be brought to an end within the next ten years, by curtailing the production and distribution of the drug 10 percent per annum for a decade.
>
> This proposal of course could only be acted upon at the first conference, composed of the opium producing nations, of which the United States is not one. The conference rejected the suggestion decisively, on the plea that it is impossible for the great powers to move with such speed as would be necessary to follow the American schedule—an argument which can only be regarded as specious.

There is an inference, if not an actual misstatement in these remarks which I would like to explain. The First Opium Conference did not reject the American suggestion of 10 percent per annum for a decade, as it was not presented to the First Conference. The proposal for controlling the making of opium made to the First Conference was that of registration and rationing, the suggestion made by the delegate for Great Britain and supported by Japan on the basis of her own experience of this method in Formosa. France categorically declared that the British proposals went too far and Holland did not support this scheme, although her statements on the subject were limited by the fact that the delegate of Holland was in the Chair. The reason given for the attitude of these countries that did not move forward was that smuggling was now so prevalent in the East that any attempt to tighten up or to change the method of control would only result in worse conditions. Whenever this statement was made the Chinese delegate questioned it on points of fact. Obviously, it is difficult to prove figures for smuggling, but the general situation in which opium is flooding the East must be recognized.

In your last paragraph you state:

> The ruling out of the American proposal to consider cutting off the opium traffic in the course of ten years by reductions of 10 percent each year created a storm with which Geneva is still reverberating.

The fact that the First Conference did not present an adequate program for the progressive reduction of smoking opium gave the American delegation an entirely adequate reason for including their 10 percent for ten years suggestion in their program for the Second Conference as one of the methods of carrying out Article II of the Hague Convention, to which the countries were pledged. Whether this plan or that of registration and rationing will prove the more practical is something which the experts in this question must thrash out at the Second Conference.

A most constructive suggestion has been made that the 10 percent for ten years plan be accepted as the end in view and that registration and rationing be considered the best method by which to obtain this end. In all fairness, it should be stated that the idea back of the American proposal originated in Sir John Jordan's motion before the Advisory Committee in August, 1924. Sir John Jordan is assessor on the League Advisory Committee on Opium and was for over forty years the British Minister in Peking, and is known as not only an expert on the opium problem, but a most devoted friend to China and to her interests, particularly in this direction. "Honor to whom honor is due."

HELEN HOWELL MOORHEAD,
Secretary Foreign Policy Association
Committee on Traffic in Opium.

New York, N. Y.

Where the Farmer Stands

SIR: Thanks for your editorial, issue of December 31, on doing something for the farmers. Your forecast as to the danger ahead of agriculture is well confirmed by the late Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, who in his report for 1924 stated:

> The improvement that has taken place has not yet lasted long enough to produce any marked betterment in the finances of the farmer. As a matter of fact, the suffering of many farmers is perhaps as intense today as it was in the first years of the depression period, because the effects of the depression are cumulative. Present favorable possibilities will have to be turned into realities before it can fairly be said that agriculture is again enjoying normal prosperity. Nevertheless, the showing of 1924 brings prosperity nearer.

Let us at least hope so.

The Secretary, in his report, properly blames government action for part of the surplus production of farm products following the war and points out that farmers have at least partly "readjusted their production to correct the unbalanced position left by the expansion of the war period."

The year-book of the Department of Agriculture for 1923 discusses the utilization of land in this country, and states that a maximum population of 350,000,000 in the United States which could be supported by the products of our farms, is indicated, but reaches the conclusion that about 300,000,000 is the probable maximum. We shall not be a deficit agricultural producing nation despite President Coolidge's prophecy, for many decades, if for a century or so. The fact that we have opened up our continent so fast constitutes a most serious menace to farmers.

Farmers' long term mortgage debt is about $8,500,000,000 and short term debt roughly $5,000,000,000. The introduction of machinery, particularly tractors, and the increasing use of electric power on farms will involve a readjustment between farming and manufacturing, and we shall probably have considerably fewer producing farmers, that is, producing commercially, in a decade than now. Whether this change in the application of labor to land can be brought about so gradually and intelligently as to enable farmers to save the equity which they may now have in their farms is a question. It is a challenge to the economic as well as the political statesmanship of the nation.

Among the legislative measures which the progressive farmers of the nation are urging upon Congress are the following:

1. Transferring the administration of the Packers' and Stockyards Act from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Trade Commission so that we may have an adequate constructive supervision of this great industry which so vitally affects millions of farmers as well as the whole consuming public. The spread between prices farmers have been receiving for livestock, hogs and sheep, and the prices most ultimate consumers have to pay for the finished product has increased in many instances under the present administration of this act.

2. Creating a government marketing corporation which will handle at least basic farm products permanently, not only for export but for domestic consumption. . . .

3. Federal crop insurance to free farmers from the tremendous losses which they now individually sustain by crop damages over which they have no control.

We have recently ascertained that the federal Land Banks can refinance long term mortgages with present money conditions to the amount of about $500,000,000 a year, and at an interest rate of 5 to 5½ percent to farmers, many of whom are now paying up to 8 percent.

The high protective duties of the Fordney-McCumber tariff act on most material which enters into products farmers must buy or the finished products must be reduced and price fixing associations which control so many of the farmers' needed supplies must be broken up. Unquestionably one of the greatest evils which has befallen farmers is speculation in lands, and progressive farmers throughout the nation are seeking a partial exemption of improvements from taxation as a means of preventing speculation in farm lands.

Last fall I campaigned from Michigan to the Pacific Coast in the northern, central and southern tiers of states and found that many farmers are already beginning again to capitalize the selling price of farm products into prices they pay or ask for farm land!

An international agreement as to limiting areas planted to staple farm products is essential to assuring farmers a fair price for their products as long as economic conditions are such that we use the cowardly expression, "over-production" instead of the accurate one "under-consumption."

In conclusion, the farmer is going to have a hard tussle with himself to get over being such an extreme individualist and plunger, which, however, is quite natural in a calling which, as so clearly shown in your editorial above referred to, is preëminently and inherently a gamble. Restriction of acreage is a severe test for many farmers but coöperative and commodity marketing organizations are driving home to farmers the necessity for adjusting production, which of course is subject to wide variation in acreage yield.

BENJAMIN C. MARSH,
Managing Director, Farmers' National Council.

Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paul Bunyan

Paul Bunyan, by Esther Shephard. Seattle: The McNeil Press. $2.50.

PAUL BUNYAN is perhaps the only American mythological hero. He is the lumberjacks' Hercules, the man who can do anything, and whose exploits in the mouth of a skilful teller can make the greenhorn gasp with astonishment. Lumberjacks have been spinning yarns about him since the sixties, and into their tales have been woven a great many of the tall stories with which legs were pulled and long hours talked away in the early frontier days. Miss Shephard has skilfully, and it seems accurately, collected a number of Paul Bunyan stories, mainly told her by loggers themselves, into a most curious and fascinating book. The stories, at their height in the eighties and nineties, seem to be going out, but as a document of our American past it is extraordinarily interesting.

When Paul Bunyan was only three weeks old he thrashed around in his sleep and knocked down four square miles of standing timber. In his first pair of pants, he drove logs down the Kennebec, and became "the greatest white-water man that ever was." He tried to play a cornet, but it "straightened right out every last link and curve in it" and the noise it made was heard 185 miles. "He used to holler so loud when he was a kid, he could kill a whole pondful of bullfrogs with one holler."

Paul logged in nearly every state, and conducted many vast enterprises, some by accident. Accidentally dragging his peavey behind him produced the Grand Cañon. He dug out Puget sound. The King of Sweden employed him to clear North Dakota, so's he'd have somewhere to send 400,000 "onruly socialists" with whom he'd "just about got to the point of 'Ship or Shoot' "—but "he didn't like to shoot, because that always looks bad in the papers, and so he figured he'd better ship." There was a story that "Paul had dug the Pacific Ocean, too, the same as he dug the Sound, but . . . Old Mr. Pacific's own grandchildren officially denied the rumor here in court a couple of years ago." Paul was not always miraculously successful. He had no luck with his mine, for the assayer's office reported the gravel to be "igneous, prehistoric, and erroneous."

While Paul has the elasticity and indefiniteness of most fabulous figures, his favorite and partner, Babe the Blue Ox, is more distinct. He measured, between the eyes, "forty-two axhandles and a Star tobacco box." "His color was blue—a fine, pretty, deep blue." Together, Paul and Babe could haul the naked log out of a tree and leave the bark and branches standing. "Paul used to have to carry a pair of field glasses around with him so as he could see what he was doing with his hind feet. Gigantic as he was, Babe was lost for three days in a hollow Sequoia Paul had cut down. Paul Bunyan was sure fond of his Ox. 'Be faithful' he used to say to him low under his breath as he walked along beside him. 'Be faithful, Babe, Faithful.' " Babe died of a surfeit of hot-cakes.

These stories are an inextricable mixture: of exact parallels with ancient mythology, its giants, heroes and cosmic explanations: of daydream longings to be stronger than one is, of things not meant to be believed, and others which might possibly take in a tenderfoot; of rambling, pointless imagination, of dreary, infantile ingenuity, of cruel practical jokes and of endless Yankee exaggeration, often strained and self-conscious, but sometimes sharp and pat, and like nothing else in the world. "Paul had such a good watch it gained enough time in the first three days to pretty near pay for itself." That must be an old one, but I had never heard it, nor most of the others, though they are in a familiar vein, and a vein which has fed much American humor, Mark Twain's in particular. The Sidehill dodger, and the Round river, sailing down which the loggers passed their own camp three times, alone are conspicuously familiar. I don't recognize Mrs. Paul Bunyan's teeth. She was very fond of chicken, her teeth were false, and she lost them in the river. Paul fished them out by lowering down a drumstick—"when them teeth sees that drumstick they just naturally snaps right onto it." I don't recognize the bedbugs "which go so smart that when you wrote your name down in the big timebook in the office and the clerk put down the number of the bunk you was going to sleep in, the bedbugs would crawl along the pen so's to know where to find you afterwards; and they always found you, too."

A queer mixture indeed, of things that ring true and false, old and new. Zip was a dog, out of greyhound by dachshund, whose hind legs were much higher than his fore, so he was always running down hill and never got tired. Paul made a bridge of prunestones "14,000 feet long, 4000 feet high and 4 feet wide." One of the cooks tried to make coffee by "just drawing his brown shirt through the coffee pot." Every regiment in France must have had that joke. The names of Paul's hands are real names: Shot Gunderson, Kangley, Charley Dobey, Red Jack, Blue-Nose Parker, Batiste Joe. They are the kind of men who, shut up in camp for a long cold winter, would tell how "the words froze in our mouths, and Paul had to send to England for a frozen word interpreter." And one of them might really say, though one doubts it:

> That was great loggin' we done in North Dakota though, like I said. Out in the woods before daylight—out among the pines. . . . And the sound of timber fallin', and the call of the loggers when they'd fell a tree: "Tim-m-mber-er! Down the line. Watch out!" I can't help it, but I always thought that a mighty pretty sound, and I do yet. "Tim-mm-ber! Down the line." A kind of fine music in the woods.

This is certainly not typical, nor the sort of thing the man on the "deacon seat" would indulge in. Nor would he often regret the passing of the "old time life and fun."

> Them days the men all knowed each other. But now it ain't that way no more . . . just jump around from one camp to another . . . and there's all kinds of them. Japs and Hawaiians and Hindoos and Polacks and Bulgarians and I don't know what all, and you never know any of 'em. . . . And all they want to talk about is politics or capital and labor . . . or somethin' like that, or else somethin' they read in the Argonaut or Windy Stories or the Literary Digest . . .

Times are changing, but somewhere they are still thinking up good ones about how Paul had a steamer whose smokestack was so high that a long time after Paul sent a man up to paint it his grandson "came down and asked if he could have some more paint."

Here's the birth of mythology, right under our nose. What's its motive? Usually long winter nights, and a hot stove, and credulous greenhorns, and an old fable you don't believe yourself touched up so that maybe one of the greenhorns, who ask silly questions about how and why and when, will believe it, or at any rate get laughed at.

ROBERT LITTELL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gypsy Anthropology

Medicine, Magic and Religion, by W. H. R. Rivers. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $3.75.

The Origin of Magic and Religion, by W. J. Perry. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. $2.50.

The Growth of Civilization, by W. J. Perry. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. $2.50.

THE combat of scientists is the most exciting sporting event in the world. This is partly due to the ferocity with which attack and counter-attack are delivered, the ruthless charge of the cohorts of the True Doctrine upon the misled supporters of the Pretended Hypothesis. But chiefly it is because of the magnitude of the issues. Crowns and thrones may perish, kingdoms rise and wane; they are mere episodes in the struggle of ideas which is the clash of conflicting civilizations. The laboratory is the supreme prize ring, the scientist the prince of sporting men. Under these circumstances the question may well be asked why the ringside is not besieged by such throngs as would make the crowds at Madison Square Garden and Boyle's Acres look like casual tea parties. The reason is that the seats are too expensive. One could watch Dempsey and Carpentier for fifty dollars. The toll at the stadium of ideas is five or ten years of special study.

Here is an issue between anthropologists. Ostensibly it is the dullest dispute imaginable, affecting nothing more thrilling than the probable origin of a dual form of social organization observed in Melanesia, in Yucatan, in ancient Egypt. One man says, "All cases of the dual organization of society came from Egypt." The other says, "I doubt it." Two professors, perfectly harmless. On the contrary, nowhere in the world today is trinitrotoluol being hurled about with more deadly consequences. The issue involved is nothing less than the whole character of European culture. Consider the matter in this light. European civilization, like any other, is intensely self-conscious. The essence of the thing is the feeling Europeans have of their cultural unity. This feeling, as always, concentrates upon the past; modern Europe, the reformation, the renaissance, the Holy Roman Empire, and the civilizations of antiquity, Rome, Greece, Egypt, the Holy Land. Upon this sense of the historical continuity of the Great European Tradition in civilization rests the white man's burden, the very meaning of the civilization which is ours and the heathendom that envelops the rest of the world. Our civilization is Civilization. "History proves it." So it does; but anthropologists doubt it. Anthropologists doubt not only this particular historical sequence but the whole theory of straight-line descent of which our supposed cultural lineage is an example. That is, some anthropologists do. Others, however, have dug elaborate trench systems of defensive theory for the European dogma. This is the T. N. T. behind "dual organization."

Behind the issue of theory there is a still more obscure issue of method. Under the influence of the evolutionary hypothesis the earlier studies of primitive society adopted an evolutionary pattern. Evolution was the "descent of man"; anthropology was therefore the descent of civilization, the evolution of England out of the savagery of the old stone age. This classical presupposition influenced early anthropologists to be collectors, to mass and arrange data from all over the world for the illumination of the ladder of history. A work that is thoroughly characteristic of this method, Frazer's Golden Bough, is still undergoing revision and republication in ever more popular form. The method of that work, as the most casual reader can see, is that of hither-and-yon collection, arrangement and synthetic (and often very fanciful) interpretation. It seems fair to call this the British tradition in anthropology. Another tradition, developed more fully by American scholars under the deanship of Franz Boas, is that of intensive, detailed, if possible, complete studies of specific cultural groups. These two methods are sharply opposed. By sticking in his thumb and pulling out plums at will, the historical anthropologist can construct a beautiful theory of descent leading whence and whither his preconceptions dictate. By digging deeper into the lore of a single people, the analytical anthropologist can prove that the plums are not plums at all but quinces.

Among British scholars this issue is rendered peculiarly acute by personal circumstances. W. H. R. Rivers was a man of such conspicuous genius that he has already become a prophet, even among his own people. His spirit requires to be placated. His mantle must be worn by an authentic successor. That successor is W. J. Perry, reader in cultural anthropology in the University of London. But Mr. Perry works by the same method practised by his pre-Riverian countrymen. He is an exponent of the European theory of civilization. By the plum method he is ready to prove that all real civilization came from Egypt (ours, of course, most directly). This study of the origin of magic and religion illuminates not religion nor magic but the European mind.

> If the Egyptian origin of the dolmen, as suggested by Elliot Smith, of pyramids, of the practice of irrigation, and of making polished stone implements, as well as of ship-building, be accepted, then the spread of early civilization throughout the world is the direct result of Egyptian influence, working directly or indirectly in any particular case. . . . It seems hard to resist the conclusion that the elaboration of ideas of immortality connected with mummification, and therefore with givers of life, was the prime cause of this great movement.

The Growth of Civilization is the description of the course taken by this great movement. In both books, theory is elaborately studded with fact. But are Mr. Perry's data sound? For a judgment upon this point let the reader refer to a review of Mr. Perry's earlier statement of his case, Children of the Sun, by Prof. Robert Lowie, whose theoretical acumen and command of fact are sufficiently attested in his Primitive Society. In this review (American Anthropologist, January-March, 1924), Mr. Perry's data are simply riddled. We await with interest the verdict of the American method upon these volumes.

Did the Gypsy theory have the approval of the great Dr. Rivers? We are urged to believe that if it did not it would shortly have had. Rivers's posthumous lectures on Social Organization contain no trace of it. In his preface to that work, Professor Elliot Smith informs the reader that just before his death Rivers was planning a session with Mr. Perry "to clear away the discrepancies in their interpretations of the evidence relating to . . . dual organization." Now in his monumental History of Melanesian Society Rivers took a definite position in this matter. He definitely attributed the dual organization he found to the circumstances of local history, and certainly not to "Egypt." But Rivers's mind was altering. In that work itself he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notes the fact. This trend, we are told (by Mr. Perry), was toward Perry. In Medicine, Magic and Religion, a detailed analysis of the interrelatedness of these interests in primitive life, Rivers remarks: "The present trend in the science which deals with these matters is to limit inquiries to a series of related peoples." The American method. To which an unsigned note is attached (is it by Mr. Perry, who edited Social Organization?): "This was written in 1915. Since then there has been a change of attitude." Another similarly unsigned note tells us of another damaging passage that it was not until later that Dr. Rivers "admitted the Egyptian origin of civilization."

This is very interesting. But we had always supposed that Dr. Rivers's mind, far from drifting back to the classical British theory was moving away from it. The intensive study of Melanesia, we had thought, brought home to him the impossibility of far-flung historical generalizations. At all events, this is what he himself said about this so important change in his way of thinking. It may be found on the first page of the second volume of the History.

> I began as a firm adherent of the English school, being almost exclusively interested in the evolution of belief, custom and institution, paying little attention to the complexity of individual cultures, except where it was perfectly obvious that changes had been set up from without, as in the case of recent Polynesian influence in Melanesia. At a definite point in my argument I was led to see that Melanesian society is complex.

This does not sound like Egypt to me.

C. E. AYRES.

Types and Personalities

Portraits: Real and Imaginary, by Ernest Boyd. New York: George H. Doran Company. $2.50.

ON the evening of the fourteenth of last July, I was sitting out in the Carrefour Vavin, on the left Bank, midway between the Rotonde and the Dôme: the Bastille had just been taken for the hundred and thirty-sixth time. Music, therefore, and illuminations; some eating and more drinking at multitudinous tables; and a good deal of rhythmic shuffling, in time with the band, on the sidewalks and the smoother passages of the pavements—in short, a phase of that "extraordinaire fermentation universelle," to employ the words of a recent writer in the Mercure de France, "telle qu'il n'en existe en aucun endroit du monde dans des proportions aussi bigarrées."

However, I might have spared myself time, trouble and expense by simply staying on my own side of the sea and waiting a few months for Mr. Boyd's Portraits. For he has come across to us and arranged a carrefour of his own. He makes of the Village and adjacent parts another Montparnasse, with plenty of stir, light and action, together with the shuffling of almost as many diverse and accentuated personalities as the most "bigarré" Parisian neighborhood could show. Nor do refreshments fail—as when Mr. Boyd makes his high-hearted endeavor to entertain Mr. Cabell. Nor music—as when the young lions of—shall we say, The Dial?—began to use the telephone, to his discomfort.

This year the Fourteenth fell on a Monday, in consequence of which the celebration ran for three days. If you happened to be lodged just 'round the corner from the festivities, you naturally attended on Saturday evening and Sunday evening as well. Very early on Tuesday morning you came to the conclusion that, after all, the celebration betrayed much of a muchness. It ran true to form, to an established type, throughout: from evening to evening little change was to be observed in its tone, temper, and texture. So, in a way, with Mr. Boyd's book, which could take three evenings too. He seems to have said: "I will be even in tone, and homogeneous in texture; and as for my temper, I will keep it under all conditions." Is the effect, after a hundred pages or so—despite all their brilliancy and action—just a little monotonous? Yes, just a little.

Mr. Boyd's temper is most successfully kept in the short interlude which separates his "real" portraits from his "imaginary" ones. Here the young gamins of the quartier break in upon the portraitist with abuse and objurgations: yes, the vie littéraire has its rafales, and is now pursued with as much of passion in New York as in Paris itself. Who can wonder? For Mr. Boyd's opening paper, Aesthete: Model 1924, which is credited in some quarters with having sold the first issue of The American Mercury off the newsstands in no time at all, has in its acute yet broadly generalized features plenty to arouse young literary æsthetes (of the date specified) to fury. However, let the fury subside.

Our author, as may readily be inferred, divides his efforts between a body of types on the one hand and a group of personalities on the other. The types are well synthesized and the personalities are well individualized—perhaps too much so for a taste not yet fully contemporaneous. However, we may recall what indulgence in personalities has been doing for The Bookman through the past few seasons. It is easily possible that some of those anonymous sketches came from Mr. Boyd's own pen. And it is as possible that he would prefer to be gauged as an intellectual force by the highly synthetic papers that make up his "first half" than by the gossipy pages that compose his second. Yes, one may very well indulge just here in the lingo of the gridiron, for Mr. Boyd, in his spiked shoes, kicks many a goal. All his energy, grit and nous seem to be concentrated in the tip of his toe. The ball soars—whether in the form of A Literary Lady, A Press Agent, A Critic or a Modern Puritan—and the scoring is accomplished. Then, as in some well-known fields of athletic endeavor, a flight of balloons is let loose. How they float aloft and fill the empyrean! F. Scott Fitzgerald, Sinclair Lewis, George Jean Nathan, Eugene O'Neill; to say nothing of that grandiose, portentous airship, so full of helium and of drive, Henry L. Mencken . . . No, never mind about Paris.

These pages bear traces of a seeming urbanity, which is essentially something quite else again. Still, I don't believe that Mr. Boyd is half so dissatisfied and cantankerous as he often seems. Having brought a fine equipment from the other side and having developed a high awareness on this, he has merely adopted an attitude, and he chooses to hold it firmly and consistently. It is not, conceivably, the best attitude that might be adopted, yet it gets results. When the ducks are flying in a compact flock, the hunter in his blind need not turn his gun toward all the points of the compass. One pose will do. A slight variation from it suffices, toward the end of our hunter's activities, to bring down a few alien fowl, as well. Alas, poor slaughtered George Moore; and Chesterton, falling with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a huge splash; and Yeats, with deranged plumage and traces of blood among the rushes! . . . "Insatiate archer!"

All of which is simply a roundabout way of saying that Mr. Boyd must be read, as one of the major diversions of the season. But he will go rather better in sips than in deep draughts, and preferably when the gastric juices of human kindness happen to be in fullest flow.

HENRY B. FULLER.

Imperial Plantations

Kenya, by Norman Leys. London: The Hogarth Press. 15s.

ONE of the demands of the recent British note to the Egyptian government was that the latter should "notify the competent Department that the Sudan government will increase the area to be irrigated at Gezira, from 300,000 feddans to an unlimited figure as need may arise." On the face of it such a demand would seem to be prompted by a genuine desire on the part of England to develop to the fullest possible extent the natural resources of Sudan on behalf of the native inhabitants. We read, however, in a later dispatch that this huge scheme is to be under the direction of the Sudan Plantation Syndicate for cotton growing, which means, of course, that little enough benefit is likely to accrue to the native peasantry except in so far as they are to become wage slaves for the enrichment of London and Lancashire shareholders.

Unfortunately of late years more and more Englishmen have come to regard industrial and financial prosperity as the most reliable indication of human happiness, forgetting that such prosperity is often enough brought about at the cost of increased misery of those sections of society least able to defend themselves. It was Joseph Chamberlain who first identified the conception of successful Imperialism with successful money-making. The older and less fashionable traditions of the British Colonial Office were far different.

Now that it has become abundantly clear that Lord Cromer's land policy in Egypt is to be reversed and concessionaires are to be given as free a hand in the development of the Nile valley as they have been in the development of other sections of the continent, it may well prove profitable to examine more closely the working-results that such plantation systems have had elsewhere on the life of the indigenous population. No book could answer this purpose better than Dr. Norman Leys's recent volume on Kenya colony, every page of which reveals only too lucidly what has happened to a subject country even less able than Egypt seems to be of looking after her own interests, when sacrificed to the profiteering schemes of an alien minority.

It must be remembered that Kenya colony was taken over as a protectorate some thirty years ago, ostensibly for the purpose "of governing and guiding those people not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world." How far the British government has fulfilled its obligations may be seen in this book. Slowly, year by year, have the interests of the natives been sacrificed to the interests of a handful of European planters; the prosperity of the colony being constantly gauged by the dividends that these favored individuals have been able to derive out of the development of their plantations by negro labor. In Kenya colony the capitalistic system has run riot. In the past certain officials have struggled gallantly to defend the rights of the natives, but in almost every case the influence of the settlers in the colony and of the financiers in London has been too strong for justice. What has taken place can be explained in a few words. The first Governor of the Protectorate expropriated for the Crown the whole of the land of British East Africa, and proceeded to alienate the best of it to a few favored Europeans who today, after thirty years of such procedure, do not number more than 2,000 souls. Meanwhile to achieve this end, certain reserves were created for the various tribes many of whom, especially perhaps the Masai and the Giriama, received, later on, scant justice at the hands of the officials responsible for their welfare.

No sooner had the most valuable arable and grazing land been alienated to these few Europeans, often for as absurd a price as a halfpenny an acre, than an insistent demand arose for cheap native labor without which the acquired plantations were valueless. But most natives, it was found, preferred to remain at home in the reserves that had been given them; so that it was presently considered necessary to stimulate a desire for wage earning by the simple method of imposing a hut tax. As the years have passed this hut tax has been increased and again increased while at the same time all that has concerned the native population has been more and more sacrificed to the interests of the settlers. Every effort, in fact, has been made to convert a native peasantry settled on the land into a native wage-earning class, a proceeding the exact opposite, be it noted, from what is the avowed aim of most responsible governments. In Kenya constant attempts have been made by the administrations to discourage economic self-sufficiency of any tribe. To be in a position to live without working on the plantations has been looked upon as immoral and as often as not, as in the notorious case of the Giriamas, has led to serious trouble with the authorities.

One would be inclined to feel more reconciled to this wholesale disruption of native life, to this cleverly devised scheme by which an enormous population is compelled to work at an average rate of three farthings an hour for a handful of avaricious employers, were it proved beyond doubt that the system was economically sound. It has been proved beyond doubt that the system is not sound. To all intents and purposes Kenya Colony is today a bankrupt country.

Perhaps the peculiar economic system of Kenya may be said to have reached its high-water mark of unfair tyranny in the late registration ordinance, whereby every native is compelled by law to carry on his person a certificate of his past employment and a copy of his finger print so that in the case of his desertion from his white employer it is an easy thing for the police to run him down. Such man-hunts cost the government some £20,000 a year. From the point of view of the white settlers the registration ordinance has been, says Dr. Leys sardonically, "a great success."

Dr. Leys makes no vague accusations. He gives chapter and verse in tracing back the various steps which have brought the native population "whose well-being and development form a sacred trust of civilization" into its present predicament. Some of the governors like Sir Charles Elliot have cynically announced that they were "not sanguine as to the future of the African races," others like Sir Edward Northey have taken pains to coat their policy with a sprinkling of moral sugar. Can we English wonder that we are sometimes accused of hypocrisy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after reading this extract from Sir Edward's inaugural speech? "The Protectorate has taken over the ownership of millions of acres of good land and the guardianship of a large native population. Is it our duty to allow these natives to remain in uneducated and unproductive idleness in their so-called reserves? I think not." Soon after this address the hut tax was again raised and the following significant circular sent round to the district commissioners. "It is the wish of the Government that natives should come out into the labor field. The necessity for an increased supply of labor cannot be brought too frequently before the various native authorities. Native chiefs and elders should be repeatedly reminded that it is part of their duty to *advise* and *encourage* young men to go out and work on plantations." It is, of course, claimed that the Africans benefit by this compulsory annual migration from their homes to the plantations, but, as Dr. Leys points out, the same claim has been made by the supporters of many servile systems in the past.

The late E. D. Morel believed that the root of all native troubles in Africa was to be found in the evils consequent upon divorcing natives from the land. This contention is strongly supported by the amazing development of West Africa where in the Gold Coast and other colonies under benevolent British direction native cultivators of the ground-nut, palm-oil, and cocoa-tree have developed trade connections worth a great many million pounds. The Colonial office, Dr. Leys thinks, should insist upon native interests in Kenya receiving the same careful attention. All "encouragement" and "moral suasion" for the purpose of driving unwilling men out of the reserves should be stopped, while at the same time every kind of native planting should be nurtured, Indian traders being once more allowed to enter the reserves in the capacity of middle men. This would mean of course a sharp rise in the wages on the European estates.

Why, we may well ask, is it so difficult to have justice done to the East African native? "The vested interests and the all-pervading influence of the wealth that is at stake are, in Kenya as elsewhere in the tropics, the skilful and insidious enemies of justice."

Apparently the strong feeling aroused by the recent incident in Egypt has been used to hand over large tracts of the Nile valley for exploitation by English financiers. What has the commercial prosperity of a few Europeans got to do with good government? "And the dwarf said, 'Something human is dearer to me than all the wealth in the world.'"

LLEWELYN POWYS.

The Dark Wood

The Man Who Died Twice, by Edwin Arlington Robinson. New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.25.

WE who have idolized Edwin Arlington Robinson for a dozen years remember now that he has always walked at the edge of a dark wood. Occasionally he has disappeared from the world of hard sunlight where we saw him, and we have followed a little way into a tangle of obscure pathways, a place of broken lights, glimmering pools and no sky; but he has always emerged again with some shrewd Yankee gesture that made his sojourn in that shadowy hinterland a mere incident. I, for one, have done my best to forget this waywardness on the part of a great and sane man, whose grip on life was so sure, so unrelenting, that he could work with instruments too precarious for other men. I told myself that whatever dark recess of the mind he might explore would be bright with his own luminous sanity.

Now Robinson has been swallowed completely by the dark wood. The Man Who Died Twice, his latest book, is the culmination of his increasing preoccupation with what might be called spiritual psychology. There is only one character in the poem: Fernando Nash, who was destined to compose great music, but dissipated his powers and was saved to no more glorious end than to beat a drum in the Salvation Army and praise God for sparing his soul and his memory of what he might have accomplished.

The actual story is left practically untold. It is the spiritual story that is recounted in full detail. Or rather, for Robinson the spiritual story is the actual and only story. The reader is in doubt as to the nature of Fernando Nash's dissipation. It may have been the writing of a symphony before he received the inspiration that he knew was to be his; it may have been a less unusual dissipation involving wine, women and a blasphemous heart. Robinson does not tell us, because to him it is a matter of no importance. It is the remorse, the pride and the crumbling spiritual stature of the wrecked musician that are of supreme and sole importance.

For want of a better term I have said that Robinson is here concerned with "spiritual psychology," by which I mean those emotions, convictions and aspirations of an individual mind relative to certain basic human concepts of a universe that is not apprehended directly by the senses. We have sense-contact with trees and people, with stars and insects, but never with such abstractions or crystallizations as heaven or hell, God or eternity. These "spiritual" concepts exist in our minds only, albeit in the minds of all of us. Hence Robinson's spiritual psychology is a study of a mind grappling with mental concepts. It never gets beyond the lobes of the human brain. It has no windows opening upon the world of common experience.

If I have made myself clear it must be apparent that this dark wood which I have used as an easy symbol represents the mazes of Robinson's poetry when it is entirely divorced from actual current happenings and perceptible phenomena. It engulfs him only when he is dealing with the spiritual processes of one person, as he is in this story of Fernando Nash. Whenever he writes about more than one person there are bridges of actuality between their separate minds, and we, the readers, have a foothold, however precarious it may be.

In The Man Who Died Twice there are perhaps a score of passages in which Fernando Nash is seen in relation to things outside of his own mind. Here Robinson is the poet whom we have idolized, with his ironic circumlocution, his extravagant lucidity, and his common sense.

> Fernando Nash was beating a bass drum
> And shouting Hallelujah with a fervor
> At which, as I remember, no man smiled,

he says near the beginning of the story; and a little later:

> The barren room—
> The same in which I found him a year later
> Was not much larger than the iron bed
> On which he sat; and all there was of music
> About the place was in a dusty box
> Of orchestrations for the janitor,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And in the competent plain face of Bach,
Calm in achievement, looking down at him.

But when he wanders into the dark wood that has neither free wind nor open vista, he writes interminably like this:

Now there was nothing for him
But to lie still and hear those coming drums,
Muffled as always in a smoky cloud
Of burning sound that in a moment more
Would burst above him into flaming rain
That once he would have welcomed on his knees,
Unspeakably. . . .

W. A. NORRIS.

A Female Monster of 1825

Frances Wright, by William Randall Waterman. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. $3.50.

BORN in Scotland, brought up in England, spending some exhilarating years in France, Frances Wright was the embodiment of liberalism in the Old World, and she saw the New World, where most of her active life was passed, through the media of faith and hope. Her first visit to America, made when she was only twenty-three years old, bore fruit in Views of Society and Manners in America—During the Years 1818, 1819, 1820. This was acclaimed with delight by liberals in Europe, although some American reviewers, while commending the book, recognized that it was "a panegyric of the warmest kind." It won for Miss Wright, however, the warm friendship of Lafayette, and the selections from their correspondence which Dr. Waterman gives throw light on revolutionary movements in France in the years 1821 to 1824. Both the writer and the reader of "travel books" may perhaps find instruction in the fact that on Miss Wright's third voyage to these shores, less than ten years later, she brought her friend, Mrs. Trollope, a fellow-liberal whose subsequent book, Domestic Manners of the Americans, forms an effective antidote to the Views of Society.

On Frances's second visit to the United States, she became absorbed in the problem of slavery, and developed a plan of education, gradual emancipation and colonization, which she proceeded to practise in Mashoba, Tennessee. It is hardly necessary to add that the scheme failed; yet, as it had the approval of four presidents of the United States—Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson, all of them Southerners—she can hardly be blamed for having had faith in it. The undertaking impaired her health, cost her half her fortune, and came near to blasting her character. The indiscretion of her associates drew from her the admission, which she would otherwise have considered as unnecessary as imprudent, that she considered the existing legal status of marriage open to criticism and that she did not view amalgamation of the races with horror. Later on when she antagonized various elements, these admissions offered ammunition which all could unite to use against her.

By this time Miss Wright's enthusiasm for the United States had become—not diminished, but tempered by the recognition of many evils which she still had faith to believe might, in this new country dedicated to freedom, be alleviated. In 1828 religious currents in America were in a turmoil beside which the present fundamentalist-modernist controversy appears as a placid eddy. On the one side, whole communities were being swept by peculiarly primitive revivals, and attempts were being made to bring back the Puritan Sabbath and to introduce a religious test for public office; this was met on the other side by an enthusiastic deistic and sceptical movement. From girlhood Miss Wright had been a disciple of Epicurus, and seeing in the evangelism of the time a danger to liberty and to the search for truth, she threw herself whole-heartedly into the fray. This was before the day of the movie, the radio, and the Sunday supplement; the audiences in the lecture hall were prepared to yield every faculty to the sway of the successful orator, and Miss Wright speedily became the standard-bearer of liberalism.

Much about this woman's career seems astonishingly modern. In her lectures she not only discussed the nature of knowledge and pleaded for equal education for the sexes and the legal protection of married women, but she outspokenly advocated birth-control, and even—mirabile dictu—appeared on the platform with her hair in short curls, which the reporters pronounced very becoming. Nevertheless, the world has progressed in one respect at least. Many of her ideas would arouse as bitter resentment now as they did then, but no modern metropolitan daily would put its objections in this particular nutshell—we quote: "Female expounders of any kind of doctrines are not to our taste," while the Louisville Focus patiently explained:

> Miss Wright . . . has with ruthless violence, broken loose from the restraints of decorum, which draw a circle round the life of women; and with a contemptuous disregard for the rule of society, she has leaped over the boundary of feminine modesty, and laid hold upon the avocations of man, claiming a participation in them for herself and her sex.

Dr. Waterman's interest is less in his heroine herself, than in the social and intellectual movements in which she played so important a part. Indeed, he has scarcely developed the very suggestive psychological material which he has at hand. Enthusiasts who can admit that the causes they love sometimes get on better without them are not ever common, and in this respect Frances Wright stands in contrast to such fellow-laborers as Frances Willard, for instance, or Florence Nightingale. It is scarcely fair, however, to criticize an author for not achieving something which he did not undertake. Certainly this scholarly study adds materially to our understanding of a not too well-known period.

ELISABETH ANTHONY DEXTER.

The German Documents

German White Book Concerning the Responsibility of the Authors of the War. New York: Oxford University Press. $2.00.

Outbreak of the World War: German Documents collected by Karl Kautsky. New York: Oxford University Press. $4.00.

Preliminary History of the Armistice. New York: Oxford University Press. $2.00.

THESE three volumes of telegrams, which have been rendered from German into English by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, form an invaluable body of material for those who want to get at first-hand information as to the immediate causes of the World War and the negotiations which concluded active fighting. At

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Peace Conference the victorious powers appointed a commission over which Mr. Lansing presided and of which Mr. J. B. Scott was a member, to draw up a report on the responsibility of the War. This commission reported that, "The War was premeditated by the Central Powers, together with their allies, Turkey and Bulgaria, and was the result of the acts deliberately committed in order to make it unavoidable. Germany, in agreement with Austria-Hungary, deliberately worked to defeat all the many conciliatory proposals made by the Entente Powers and their repeated efforts to avoid war." Much water has flowed under the bridge since the days of the Peace Conference, and students are coming to realize the historical falsity and moral injustice of this dictum, which has been incorporated in substance into Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles. "Unfortunately," as Mr. Brown himself says in his preface to the first volume above, "no Germans were allowed to take part" in the conferences and deliberations which framed the treaty. Much worse than that. Before being compelled to sign the dictated peace, the Germans heard of the intention to declare them solely responsible. They therefore presented to the Allies this German White Book Concerning Responsibility, commonly known in German by its sub-title, Deutschland Schuldig? In this they brought forward a large number of hitherto unknown documents from their own and the Serbian archives, tending to show that Germany was by no means solely responsible. The commissioners paid virtually no attention to this important statement; had they done so, they might have saved themselves from the unfortunate dictum, which is now repudiated by historical scholars, but which has meanwhile caused untold bitterness. Mr. Scott, acting for the Carnegie Endowment, in giving to the American public an English translation of the official statement which Germany presented at Paris in 1919, has made honorable amends, so far as possible, for his blindness and that of the Allies five years ago.

The German Documents Collected by Karl Kautsky, which were published in four volumes in 1919, comprise all the important dispatches which passed through the German Foreign Office in July, 1914. As they indicate the hour and minute at which each telegram was sent and received, they enable the student now to know precisely what the German government was doing during those critical days. One sees they blundered criminally on July 5 in giving Austria a free hand against Serbia, and in thinking that Russia would not take up arms to prevent a humiliation of Serbia. Later in the month, when Germany realized the danger of a world war, she did attempt at the eleventh hour to restrain her ally. She urged upon Austria mediation for peace, as desired by Sir Edward Grey, but such mediation was thwarted by Saxony and the Russian militarists who persuaded the Tsar to order general mobilization.

The telegrams in the Preliminary History of the Armistice picture vividly the violent changes of mind on the part of Ludendorff, who at one moment wanted to go on fighting to the last ditch, and at the next urged the speediest peace negotiations as the only means of saving the army from a complete débâcle. They reveal the conflict and confusion between the civil authorities in Berlin and the military leaders at the German Great Headquarters. They also make clear the hopelessness of the German situation after the collapse of Austria and Bulgaria. It was the sudden realization of this hopelessness and of the complete defeat, coming after so many false assurances of ultimate victory by the military authorities, which caused the revulsion of feeling among the German masses against the old imperial government and led to the revolution and establishment of the German Republic. The German army was not defeated by any "stab in the back" from the Socialists at home, but the immense superiority of the Allies and by Ludendorff's straining of the German resistance to the breaking point.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Fiction Briefs

Brown Stone Front, by Gilbert W. Gabriel. New York: The Century Company. $2.00.

BOOKS in which the environment plays the rôle of villain or hero are many among us. Mrs. Wharton, Sinclair Lewis, Hergesheimer, Edna Ferber, to name a very few, have saved their most sinister or most radiant costumes, not for characters but for cities.

The dark protagonist of Mr. Gabriel's book is the sterile respectability of the New York 'nineties. This the author records with a detail whose faithfulness is positively ghastly. We smell the moth balls of Mrs. Ladd's store closets and see the installation of the oriental cosy corner, we hear the clatter of the stray horse cab, and feel the nobby architecture of the double bed on the top floor.

Back of the brown stone front passes a series of vivid people: Emily, whose head keeps high above the clouds while her feet tread flagged pavements; Prue, her sister, the little light-footed Philistine; their men: Robert, Emily's idol, whose feet are only of brown stone; Mario, the genius who is content to design letter-heads. The drawing of this cast is good, full of sympathy and discernment. The movement is close to the eye, slow, but in perfect focus.

The one weakness of the book is a lack of emphasis in the balance. Is Mr. Gabriel dealing with a city in terms of vitality, or with four characters against a background? The characters live, and the reader wishes to live with them. He demands nothing more than the story of their lives, their daily bread, at the hands of so deft a writer. They are too interesting to rank as mere population, the mark of the census during the turn of the century. So the reader asks for bread and the author hesitates. Sometimes it is bread that he gives him, sometimes brown stone. Both are good.

M. E. O.

Tomorrow and Tomorrow, by Stephen McKenna. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. $2.00.

THE only thing likely to turn us against English Liberalism is the offensive nobility of its representatives in fiction. Stephen McKenna writes not only of men like gods, but presents the Liberal group as a sort of Communion of Saints of whom their world is—and certainly their wives are—not worthy. These latter are the familiar "sensationalists" of the Sonia series,—predatory neurasthenics and irresponsible rakes. The two sexes divide nicely the virtues and vices between them, and share only a class-arrogance seemingly more consistent with extreme Toryism than effulgent Democracy. Seen through the gleaming monocle of Aristocratic Liberalism, Tomorrow and Tomorrow is a moving picture of changing public opinion in the years immediately following the "peace to end peace."

D. B. W.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Apple of the Eye, by Glenway Wescott. New York: The Dial Press. $2.50.

IN The Apple of the Eye the character of Dan Strane is interpreted indirectly through four individuals, foreign, like him, to a provincial environment. These are "Bad" Hannah Madoc, whose life, without consolation of the conventions, is interwoven with the youth of Dan's uncle, Jule. The first third of the book is devoted to a sympathetic and painstaking review of their story. The second five chapters establish Dan and introduce Mike, the third interpretive agent, a Nietzschean hired man who carries forward the Hannah-motif. The tragedy of Rosalia, a principal in this part of the book, has nothing directly to do with the story. The last five chapters continue Dan and relate to the Hannah-motif a fourth unconventional character, Mrs. Dunham. The danger that a mathematical pattern of such simplicity will fail to balance is not entirely avoided here. And where the problem is a structural one, emphasis badly distributed will destroy the significance of the study, however intact remains the beauty of its presentation. Mr. Wescott writes a finely cadenced prose. He is humane and enlightened in his attitude toward his material. Nature he sees familiarly and appreciatively, and utilizes to enforce the moods of his characters in a way that recalls the similar device in Meredith's Love in a Valley. Yet all these graces do not conceal the truth that the relating of Hannah to Mike and of Mrs. Dunham to Hannah is forced and the drawing throughout disproportionate. Mr. Wescott is essentially a poet, with a mind and eye that delight in detail. Thus the ornamentation of The Apple of the Eye becomes impressive; and the architecture Palladian.

H. G.

Some Do Not, by Ford Madox Ford. New York: Thomas Seltzer. $2.50.

AN exasperating book. Some of it is very good: a dozen characters emerge from it with the dust and odor of life clinging to them—the stolid, sensitive, dazed hero, Christopher Tietjens; the sharp, fatuous arriviste, Macmaster; Christopher's wife, Sylvia, bored and impassively loose; Father Consett—quite enough to set any novel up for a long career. The movement of the story itself however is as awkward and lumbering as Tietjens, and one is led doggedly through to the last page more because of the fine authenticity of detail than because of any inherent "go" in the situation itself. The hero, who takes his wanton wife back to discipline his soul, and enlists in the War in order to discipline his body, this prescient and priggish scion of a Yorkshire county family is not exactly incredible: what is incredible is that Mr. Ford apparently admires his behavior and his prejudices. If Mr. Ford did not sentimentalize Tietjens's inhibitions, his reserves, his internal tendernesses, and his encyclopædic mind, the honesty and spiritual continence that accompany these qualities would not, perhaps, seem falsified too. Mr. Ford the novelist is sturdy, keen, hard: Mr. Ford the commentator on English society is ever so lightly fatuous. And that is what is exasperating.

L. M.

Pipers and a Dancer, by Stella Benson. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.00.

MISS BENSON'S flair—her humor and her sharp eye for absurdity—are present in this tale of a prancing ego, set down in the midst of a European colony in China; but while the surface quality of the characters is real, their effect is shadowy, as though they had still to be modeled and defined. What is worse, the story ends before it has scarcely begun. We deserve better of Miss Benson.

L. M.

Redcliff, by Eden Phillpotts. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

ONLY Eden Phillpotts could introduce us to the entire population of a village, even a Devonshire village, and present each individual so as to win and hold our interest and finally our affection. His characters are the old salts of the earth, for the most part. One meets an occasional rascal, but their rascality does not carry overwhelming conviction, or taint the fresh, salty sweetness of candor and goodwill that pervades this chronicle of Redcliff like the strong soft tang of West Devon air. Shrewd philosophy and very uncommon sense mingle in the tart humor of its speech and enliven the varied situation of the village life. There is no more "plot" than there is "composition" in an early tapestry. The little groups of figures are quaint, funny and naïvely beautiful, and the whole is woven of the thread of simple human intercourse, and colored grave and gay with common cares and passions. In the simple lives of simple folk Mr. Phillpotts reveals the fundamentals of human relations and the essentials of human needs.

D. B. W.

Blind Raftery, by Donn Byrne. New York: The Century Company. $2.50.

THIS is a romantic lyric to an Irish tune, with haunting pathos running under the beauty of its melodious composition. Mr. Byrne is one more Irish poet although his instrument is prose, with which he plays for the delight of those that have "an ear for a harp or a heart open to a poem" as did blind Raftery with his harp for the delight of the great poetic Irish nation.

D. B. W.

Contributors

FELIX FRANKFURTER, professor of law at Harvard Law School, has written several books on legal cases.

JAMES M. LANDIS is a Research Fellow at the Harvard Law School.

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES, British economist, has written extensively on the matter of reparations adjustment.

T. K. WHIPPLE is associate professor of English in the University of California.

OSCAR RIDDLE, a scientific investigator and teacher, is on the research staff of the Carnegie Station for Experimental Evolution.

CHESTER T. CROWELL contributes stories and articles to various current periodicals.

WITTER BYNNER is a poet and playwright whose translation (with Dr. Kiang Kang-hu) The Jade Mountain appeared last year.

HENRY B. FULLER, novelist, contributes frequent reviews to the New Republic.

LLEWELYN POWYS is a novelist, the author of Black Laughter, published last year.

W. A. NORRIS, formerly instructor in English at Harvard University, is on the news staff of the Milwaukee Sentinel.

ELISABETH ANTHONY DEXTER is professor of history at Skidmore College.

SIDNEY B. FAY, professor of history at Smith College, contributes frequently to leading periodicals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED